## CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Nº LXIX. OCTOBER 1892.

## ART. I.—THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE 'HIGHER CRITICISM.'

I. Canon and Text of the Old Testament. By Dr. FRANTS BUHL, Ordinary Professor of Theology at Leipzig, Translated by the Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A., Findhorn. (Edinburgh, 1892.)

2. The Canon of the Old Testament. An Essay on the Gradual Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture, By HERBERT EDWARD RYLE, B.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Professorial Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Ripon. (London and New York, 1892.)

3. The Old Testament in the Jewish Church. A Course of Lectures on Biblical Criticism. By W. ROBERTSON SMITH. Second Edition, revised and much enlarged. (London and Edinburgh, 1892.)

4. The Early Religion of Israel. As set forth by Biblical Writers and Modern Critical Historians. The Baird Lecture for 1889. By JAMES ROBERTSON, D.D., Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Glasgow. (Edinburgh and London, 1892.)

THERE can no longer be any doubt that Old Testament criticism is the question of the day. The relation of the Old Covenant to the New has to be rediscussed and, it may be, resettled by the present or the succeeding generation. And as the character of the training ordained for mankind by God as preparatory to the sending of His first-begotten into the world can never be a matter of secondary importance, the sooner it is fully discussed and, if possible, decided, the better.

The four books we have placed at the head of the present article are devoted to a discussion of the Canon and VOL. XXXV.—NO. LXIX.

B

t

11

W

0

F

n

bili

SC

D

re

re ba

th

th

he

D

CO

ac

ing

in

in

se

po

Dr

Its

uns

is t

has

ow

Pro

sert

add

text of the Old Testament, and of the early history of Israel. The first devotes itself exclusively to the history of the Canon and the means of determining the text. The last confines itself equally exclusively to the history of the origin of the lewish religion. The remaining volumes, as will be seen, are concerned to a greater or less extent with the text of the Old Testament. Dr. Buhl's book will call for little notice on our part. It is a simple but most satisfactory account of the history of the Canon of the Old Testament, so far as it is known to us, together with ample information concerning the materials for the formation of a correct text. The work is based upon the latest investigations of scientific research on these points, and the sources are indicated whence fuller knowledge, if required, may be obtained. It is scarcely possible to overrate the value of such a volume to the student who is ignorant of German, or who has no time for extended researches. He will find here information fully up to date concerning the materials for a fuller textual criticism than has hitherto been possible in the case of the Old Testament. The history of the text of the Bible itself, an account of the various versions, the present state of their texts, and the degree in which each of them is calculated to throw light on the original—all these are stated with a clearness which leaves little to be desired. But the whole work rests on a definite historical basis. does not enter into the questions which are now agitating the Christian world concerning the date and mode of composition of the Sacred Books. He does, it is true (p. 42), leave it to be inferred that he throws in his lot with those who 'assume that there has been no essential recasting of the Pentateuch after Ezra,' and he believes that the Law had been already regarded as Canonical 'before the institution of the Samaritan community, and of the worship on Gerizim.' He regards Ezra and Nehemiah (p. 8) as having 'introduced among the Jews the "Book of the Law" as Canonical Scripture, and made it the ruling standard for their religious and social life.' He recognizes no post-exilic portions of that law, though, in common with Professor Robertson Smith, he regards the Hagiographa as having originally been of inferior authority, and he speaks of Canticles, Esther, and Ecclesiastes as among the antilegomena of the Jewish Church.1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> He points out (p. 29) how it was discussed by the Rabbis whether these books 'defiled the hands,' i.e. whether they required special care and reverence in the handling, like the rest of the O. T. See Robertson Smith, O. T. in the Jewish Church, pp. 185, 186. Professor Ryle (pp. 75-142) adopts the same view.

n

S

e

e

d

ır

y

to

ls

n

S,

if

te

of

ill

ils

in

he

nt

is

ed

he

ıhl

ng

m-

ave

as-

ta-

een

the

He

ced

rip-

and

hat

, he

rior

stes

ether

care rtson (pp.

Professor Ryle's Essay takes a wider range. He enters fully into the questions so warmly debated at the present time, and he leaves us in no doubt which way his sympathies incline. In his preface he speaks (p. x) of the 'admirable' work of Professor Driver. He fully accepts the conclusions of modern criticism in regard to the sources of our present Pentateuch. He believes the 'Elohist' to have written his narrative in the 'eighth or ninth' century B.C. (p. 24), the 'Book of the Covenant' (i.e. Exod. xx. 20-xxiii. 33) to have been derived from 'an earlier,' possibly a 'much earlier, literary source' than either the Elohist or the Jehovist. 'As a body of laws' he believes it to be 'suited to the needs of a society in a very early stage of civilization.' The Book of Deuteronomy he refuses, with Professor Robertson Smith, to regard as a forgery of Hilkiah's.1 But he thinks it could not have been written earlier than about 690 B.C. (p. 56). He regards what is termed the Priestly Code as having been elaborated during the exile, and as having been embodied with the rest of the Law in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah into the Pentateuch in the form we now have it (p. 83). Thus he accepts without reserve the main principles of Professors Driver and Robertson Smith. But though he believes the contents of 'the Law' as handed down by Ezra to have been acknowledged by the people as sacred and accepted as binding (p. 83), he does not attempt to deal with the difficulty involved in the theory of a redactor who compiled a narrative in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, in which he makes large use of another narrative, itself post-exilic, and containing 'secondary and posterior strata'2 and the like, such as is postulated by Wellhausen abroad and accepted by Canon Driver at home.3

Professor Ryle's book is written in a bright and lively style. Its tone is sober and reverent, and its method and arrangement remarkably clear. But the general result strikes us as unsatisfactory. The impression his essay leaves on the mind is that, while not venturing to contradict the authorities he has followed, he has nevertheless considerable doubt in his own mind whether their conclusions are sound. Though he sits with an almost touching submissiveness at the feet of Professors Robertson Smith and Driver, he seems to have an

O. T. in the Jewish Church, p. 363.
 Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the O. T., p. 35.
 He does, however, admit that there may have been a 'few later insertions,' in spite of Professor Robertson Smith's philippic against 'late additions' (O. T. in the Jewish Church, p. 325).

uneasy consciousness that after all something may be amiss. And so there is a hesitating tone manifested throughout the volume. From the historical point of view it contrasts unfavourably with that of Dr. Buhl. The latter is based on fact, the former very largely on conjecture. Our 'conception of a Canon of Scripture,' we are told (p. 15), 'may point us back to an earlier time, when the writings of which they are composed had their place among the ordinary literature of a believing people.' 'Circumstances might arise which would . . . make it advisable either to embody in writing the sacred teachings of the past, or to recognize the authority and sanctity of certain writings already existing.' This (p. 16) would take place because 'the peril of national disintegration and the break up of national worship might reveal' a necessity for such a step. He admits (p. 40) that we have 'practically no evidence' for the theories concerning the 'methods by which the collections of songs, laws, narratives, and prophecies were made and transmitted' adopted by the scholars he has elected to follow. It might, therefore, on the whole have been as well to avoid any direct statements such as are made in pp. 18-40 concerning the date to which various excerpts from the Pentateuch must 'doubtless' be assigned.

Yet while he makes bold to tell us (p. 39) how 'a commencement' was 'made of preserving in writing collections of prophetic utterances,' his assertion is based upon nothing more than the probability that the 'more important' of the utterances of the great prophets 'would be preserved' by their disciples, most probably by their being committed to memory 1 (p. 53). He goes on to inform us that we may 'very nearly take it for granted' that the compiler of the Books of Kings, when he mentioned 'the Book of the Law,' 'must have had in his mind' the 'Deuteronomic writings.' He proceeds to account for the composition of Deuteronomy in the reign of Hezekiah by similar hypothetical considerations. The abolition of the high places 'must have seemed to the common people like the annihilation of the constant witness . . . to the reality of their religion,' while the 'removal' of their priests 'must have seemed like the withdrawal of sentinels. from their posts' (p. 59). After 'the warning conveyed by the overthrow of the Northern kingdom,' 'we may suppose

h

¹ Professor Ryle, like all disciples of the German critical school, assumes that Micah and Isaiah (in Mic. iv. 1-3 and Is. ii. 2-4) are quoting from some earlier prophet. Micah certainly cannot have quoted Isaiah, but there is no reason whatever that Isaiah should not have been quoting Micah.

S

S

S

f

e

r

S,

d

0

of

i-

n

0

ir

ls.

y

se

ng

h,

ng

that one or more of the prophets of the kingdom of Judah arose and sought to supply the sore religious need of their countrymen.' This admittedly uncertain supposition is regarded as forming one of the grounds of an 'explanation' which (p. 60) 'satisfactorily accounts for the combination of the homiletic style, characteristic of literature in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., with a formulation of laws which included some of the most ancient statutes.' But this book (p. 63) 'can hardly' have been received with any 'very considerable' degree of veneration 'before the exile.' We shall. nevertheless, 'probably be right to connect' (in connecting?) 'the prevalence of Deuteronomic thought in later writings with the feelings of veneration excited by the "Book of the Law."' The exile, we are further told, 'was an age of literary activity' (p. 70). In such an age (p. 69) it was 'almost sure to happen that the heightened veneration for the most ancient records would result in some endeavour to connect them with the "Book of the Law" which was so dependent on them.' We conjecture, therefore, that the Deuteronomic law having received its definitely historical setting, the Book of Joshua was added to it by the scribe . . . who so freely edited the Jehovist-Elohist narrative in the spirit of the Deuteronomic Scripture.' The Jehovist-Elohist writings were, he subjoins, at that time added to the Deuteronomic. But 'the use of this larger literary work would not have commended itself all at once for general acceptance. For all we know, it may have had to compete with other similar compilations, and have survived them on account of its intrinsic superiority' (p. 71). Having thus 'regarded it as probable that the compilation of the priestly laws had gradually taken place among the Jews in Babylon,' and that 'the great Jehovist and Elohist narrative' and the 'Deuteronomic writings had been combined with them' (p. 77), Professor Ryle proceeds, after a number of other suppositions of what 'would' or 'might' have taken place, or of what had 'probably been going on' (in one case he uses the curious phrase 'modern criticism has probably shown incontrovertibly that,' &c.), to his conclusion that the Law was published in its present form (p. 83) in the time of Ezra, though 'its influence would only very gradually be obtained,' and 'none could have foreseen its future absolute sway' (p. 84).2

Most sound students of history would regard this method

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The italics throughout are ours.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This is also the view of Professor Robertson Smith as expressed in p. 43 of his work.

of writing it as open to considerable objections, though they will probably regard the caution with which Professor Ryle expresses himself as under the circumstances eminently commendable. But Professor Ryle combines with it another method to which they are likely to take even more serious exception. Following writers of the type of which Wellhausen is perhaps the most conspicuous example, he bases a large number of important conclusions on assertions of which he does not attempt to give a proof. Thus, after stating, in his more cautious vein, that 'the conception of a Canon of Scripture may point us back to a yet earlier time, when the writings of which it is composed had their place among the ordinary literature of a believing people' (p. 15), he goes on:

'The literature must first arise before the process of selection begins that leads to the formation of a Sacred Collection. Again, so far as the community is concerned, we see that a community which selects a Canon of Scripture, will not only be a believer in the God Who is recognized in that literature, but must also have reached that particular stage in its religious history, when the possibility of the revelation of the Divine Will through the agency of human literature has dawned upon the consciousness of the nation. This last point is of importance. For there is nothing at all improbable in a religious community existing for a long period without the adoption of any particular writings as the embodiment of belief, or as the inspired and authoritative standard of worship and conduct: least of all would this be improbable, if there were other, and seemingly, no less authoritative, means of declaring the commands of God and of maintaining His worship unimpaired' (p. 15).

But Professor Ryle has quite forgotten that in the matter of a Canon of Scripture we are not left to à priori considerations to determine how it originated. We have the Christian Scriptures before us. And, though it was a long, a very long, time before a Canon of the New Testament Scriptures was formally drawn up, yet we know for certain that it was not drawn up on the principles on which Professor Ryle assumes the Hebrew Canon to have been formed. The New Testament was regarded as authoritative from the very first, because it was known to have emanated from persons who were capable of speaking with authority on the subjects on which they wrote. Pari ratione, then, we are at least entitled to a presumption in favour of the theory that the Books of the Law, whatever annotations and additions were ultimately brought into their text, were first issued by persons who could speak with authority as to the character of Mosaic institutions, that the historical Scriptures (with the exception, perhaps, of tho bec with pos wer

189

pro pho

son

por tio teu in col any Ca wri had fab bel cor equ wit cri Ho of to and inf not Ag

> hav the por

ear

me

wh

he

gar Scr tori still those in the Hagiographa), were received with veneration because they were written by men who were not only familiar with the facts, but who had given unequivocal signs of the possession of prophetic gifts, and that the prophetic Scriptures were accepted because, in the opinion of their contemporaries and immediate successors, their writers had by unquestioned proofs made good their title to the possession of similar prophetic powers.

But this is not the only place in which the wiser expression 'may' gives place to the less cautious 'must.' The songs which Professor Ryle supposes to have been the earliest portions of Hebrew literature, must have owed their preserva-tion chiefly to oral tradition.' The 'analysis of the Pentateuch,' he goes on, following the worst methods of his masters in critical science, 'has shown conclusively that numerous collections of Israelite laws were made at different times before any part of our present Pentateuch' had been received as Canonical Scriptures (p. 22). Mr. Matthew Arnold and writers of his stamp used to tell us how modern criticism had shown conclusively that the Gospel of St. John was a fabrication of the latter half of the second century. But the belief in the authenticity of that Gospel has survived these confident assertions. It is possible that assertions made with equal confidence concerning the Old Testament may meet with a similar fate. Again, we are told that what is known to critics, from Professor Klostermann onwards, as the 'Law of Holiness,' contains extensive excerpts' from an older collection of laws, and that this is 'a fact which no scholars have ventured to dispute '(p. 26). The statement, however, has been disputed, and by men who may fairly claim attention. We can only infer, therefore, from Professor Ryle's language, that he does not consider such persons as entitled to the name of scholars. Again, the Deuteronomic Laws 'are clearly dependent' upon earlier collections of laws. And it is by a succession of statements of this kind, without even a reference to the authorities who are supposed to have established these conclusions, that he imagines himself to have said 'enough, and more than

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Thus the prophets Nathan, Gad, Iddo, Shemaiah, are mentioned as having written histories. And there is reason for the supposition that the Books of Kings were ultimately compiled by Jeremiah, and that some portion of the compilation was the work of Isaiah.

portion of the compilation was the work of Isaiah.

<sup>2</sup> It is curious that the Book of Jashar should be so persistently regarded by the critics as an early book, when both the references to it in Scripture are manifest additions, and when not even the latest of the historical Psalms ever refers to so startling an event as the sun's standing still.

enough,' to 'convince us that various collections of laws were made at different times during the history of the people' (p. 30). Professor Ryle has certainly a very strange notion of the nature of a demonstration for a member of a University which requires the books of Euclid to be studied before

admission to a degree.

We shall see presently how Professor Robertson deals with the question of the Three Codes, in respect of which Professor Ryle commits himself unreservedly to the theories of Kuenen, Wellhausen, and Driver. We shall also see how he deals with another theory to which Professor Ryle gives a more qualified adhesion, that the 'conduct and life' of the sons of the Prophets 'may in some respects be illustrated, as has been often pointed out, by the dervishes of the East in modern times' (p. 57). We might remark, in passing, that the conduct and life of the dervishes would supply us with a better illustration of the conduct and life of the earlier prophets than the dervishes themselves. But we pass this by. Life is too hurried in these days to permit people in general to pay attention to the construction of their sentences. But a knowledge of the ordinary laws of evidence might at least be required of those who attempt to deal with the history of a nation. And such knowledge is conspicuous by its absence among the members of the school of criticism with which Professor Ryle has thrown in his lot. Of the Book of Deuteronomy, which, as he correctly states, was discovered in the Temple in the year 621 B.C., he proceeds to remark (p. 56) that 'the literary framework of the book is not to be placed earlier than circ. 690 B.C.' The book itself, then, must have been of later date. But between 690 and 621 B.C. there was a period of sixty-nine years. Is it conceivable that, after the discovery of the book, there would have been no effort to ascertain whether any such volume existed in previous times, or that there would be no man living capable of testifying with authority on the subject? It was one of the deepest significance to the whole nation. It was proposed to base a religious reformation of the widest and most far-reaching character upon the contents of the volume when discovered. And yet Professor Ryle tells us that he 'inclines' to the conclusion that seventy years previously no such book was in existence. A very little study of the laws of evidence would have 'inclined' Professor Ryle to an opposite conclusion. The writer of these pages once conversed with a survivor of the battle of Trafalgar, and received from him an account of the commencement of that action,

incl alm His neve to a ques to a mus in t year of p batt have sacr who cont will haus befo seve this clear marl the 1 II. crop It is the analy alrea to pa

1892

tion.
in the that thave site coproba Luke' of the portion others

and n

proac

that

ct.

re

e'

on

er-

re

ils

ch

es

w

a

he

as in

at

a

er

nis

in

es.

at

he

by

m

he

as

0-

he

he

en Is

re

ch

no

t?

It

nd

ne

he

no

WS

an

n-

ed

n,

including an account of the language used by Nelson himself, almost verbally coincident with that to be found in Alison's History of Europe, a book which the old man in question had The battle of Trafalgar, it is true, is an event never seen. to an Englishman of no common importance. Yet it may be questioned whether it is of anything like as much importance to an Englishman of the present day as the laws of Israel must have been to their authorized guardians and expounders in the days between Hezekiah and Josiah. If eighty-six years after its occurrence it would be easy to find thousands of persons who had conversed with survivors of that great battle, could it possibly have been difficult for King Josiah to have collected scores of persons capable of telling him what sacred books were in existence in the reign of Hezekiah, who died seventy-seven years previously, and what were their The 'ordinary laws of historical investigation' will justify us in 'refusing to believe,' to use one of Wellhausen's favourite syllogisms, that a book which was not written before 690 B.C. could possibly have been mistaken less than seventy years afterwards for the original Law of Moses. That this was the impression actually produced by the book is clear enough from 2 Kings xxiii. 24, 25, and it may be remarked in passing that Leviticus xix. 31, xx. 27, seem to be the passages referred to in the narrative, and not Deut. xviii. But that is only one of the endless difficulties which crop up on the assumption that the critical theory is established. It is to be hoped that some day the new patchwork theory of the Pentateuch will receive as severe and as unsparing an analysis at the hands of scholars as the Old Testament has already experienced. We shall be much surprised if it prove to pass equally well through the ordeal.1

To return to Professor Ryle. It is not to be supposed that the whole of his essay is of the same character as the

¹ Professor Ryle's critical methods are not altogether beyond question. He adopts the theory which supposes, from the discrepancies in the form of the Ten Commandments in Exodus and Deuteronomy, that they originally existed in a shorter form. He does not appear to have remembered that competent critics have come to an exactly opposite conclusion on the subject of the inscription on the Cross. It is most probable that the words 'deliver us from evil' are not to be found in St. Luke's report of the Lord's Prayer. Is that a proof that it is not a part of the 'original form' of that prayer? The idea, too, that only the portions of the Synoptic Gospels which are found in all three are portions of the original narrative has been contested by Dr. Salmon and others. It is a sufficient answer to it to bear in mind that the longest and not the shortest report in the daily press contains the nearest approach to the *ipsissima verba* of a modern popular orator.

portions that have been quoted. Like Professor Driver, he becomes rational and logical as soon as he leaves the vexata quæstio of the Pentateuch. In common with most modern writers, he believes the Jewish Canon to have been gradually composed, and he remarks on the doubts entertained, even in later days, as to the canonicity of Esther, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon. His treatment of the date of the Septuagint Version, and of the ground of the inclusion of the Apocryphal books in that Version, is no doubt open to criticism. And in his idea that the Old Testament Canon was not finally completed till the Council of Jamnia, or circ. A.D. 100, he is at variance with many high authorities. But in his Appendix A, in which he traces to their source the two fables that the Old Testament was rewritten by Ezra, and that the men of the Great Synagogue wrote a considerable portion of the Old Testament, he has done good service. No one who has not actually undertaken the task of investigation can conceive to how great an extent the habit has obtained among historians and commentators of repeating without examination the statements of those who have gone before them. Professor Ryle has helped us with admirable clearness to the information where and how these fables originated.

Professor Robertson Smith is a writer of a very different stamp. His keen and powerful logic contrasts strongly with the flippant dogmatism of Wellhausen, the hesitating uncertainty of Professor Ryle, and the unsatisfactory methods of Professor Driver. He adopts and defends the conclusions embraced by these writers, but in his mode of stating them he stands alone. Kuenen certainly may be said sometimes to approach him in his appreciation of what constitutes an argument. But as a rule it is at a respectful distance. If anyone wishes to know what real arguments can be offered in support of the new criticism, it is to the writings of Professor Robertson Smith that he must turn. His masterly thirteenth chapter—which, as he tells us in his Preface, is almost entirely new matter-states the case for the new theories in a very different manner to that in which it is presented by any other author with whom we are acquainted. This chapter is well and closely reasoned throughout. Instead of being repelled and irritated by the perpetual resort to assumptions, the wearisome iteration of assertions which are made to do duty for arguments, the reader is fairly staggered at first by the clearness and cogency of the considerations which are advanced. It is not until he finds that it is in

truth been p have l Oi

1892

his wo Here fessors auther that v satisfa Germa natura (p. 19) do hir withou be pre supern suspici allowin argum which In a fo that P on the coalitio of sucl well as distinc are by by whi post-D not de hypoth history

He base ar his sch less fre critical the care history. of the o have b hypoth Oct.

, he

cata

lern

ally

n in

and

Sep-

the

riti-

was

A.D.

his

bles

the

n of

who

can

ong

iina-

nem.

the

erent

with

un-

ds of

sions

them

es to

s an

fered

Pro-

sterly

ce, is

new

s pre-

inted.

stead

ort to

h are

gered

ations

is in

If

truth the case for the prosecution, and that only, which has been placed before him, that he can resist the pleadings which

have been so skilfully arranged.

Our space does not permit us to deal with that portion of his work in which he deals with the general history of the Canon. Here he will be found on the whole in agreement with Professors Ryle and Buhl. . It is with the question of the general authenticity and credibility of the Old Testament history that we are chiefly concerned. And here we remark with satisfaction at the outset that he utterly refuses, with the German critics, to assume the impossibility of the supernatural. If he can be shown, he says, to have done this (p. 19), he 'will frankly confess that he is in the wrong.' do him justice, he does nothing of the kind. No man is without his prejudices. And Professor Robertson Smith may be pretty safely set down as a man who is inclined to view supernatural details in a history with a certain amount of suspicion. But it would be most unfair to charge him with allowing this habit of mind to lead him to dispense with argument. His clearness of head is shown by the way in which he handles the narrative of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. In a former number of this Review 1 the fact was mentioned that Professor Driver dismisses this narrative as unhistorical on the ground of the impossibility of a politico-ecclesiastical coalition. Professor Robertson-Smith admits the absurdity of such a contention. He grants (p. .403) that 'modern as well as ancient history is full of examples of the union of distinct political parties against a common antagonist.' We are by no means convinced of the soundness of the reasoning by which he endeavours to prove that the Korah episode is post-Deuteronomic. But at least it is reasoning. It does not depend, as Professor Driver's argument does, upon an hypothesis which goes counter to the whole course of human history.

He is not, it is true, altogether free from the tendency to base arguments on assumptions which vitiates the methods of his school, though it must be confessed he resorts to it far less frequently than the rest. But he tells us (p. 16) that the critical study of ancient documents means nothing else that the careful sifting of their origin and meaning in the light of history.' If all critical investigation had been of this kind, much of the opposition which the critics have met with would never have been offered them. It is the continual presentation of hypothesis in the place of history of which we feel that the

<sup>1</sup> Church Quarterly Review for January 1892, pp. 356-7.

1892

student of Scripture has a right to complain. Again (p. 171), he brushes aside the very interesting, and most natural and probable, account in 2 Macc. ii. of Nehemiah's endeavour to preserve the ancient literature of his country with the remark that 'the transparent object of the passage is to palm off upon the reader a whole collection of forgeries, by making out that the author and his friends in Palestine possess, and are willing to communicate, a number of valuable and sacred books not known in Egypt.' There is not the slightest foundation in the passage for this wholesale accusation. It is assumed, again (p. 260), that the prohibition of the 'maççeba' in Deuteronomy xvi. 22, relates to all upright pillars, whereas the context shows that idolatrous pillars only are referred to. Once more, we are told authoritatively that the Cherethites and Pelethites were a foreign bodyguard (p. 261), whereas competent scholars, such as Gesenius, for instance, have declared that this conclusion cannot possibly be maintained. To do Professor Robertson Smith justice, however, this substitution of assumption for argument is seldom met with in his pages.

We must, however, turn to the question of the credibility of the history. The Professor points out, fairly enough, the signs of compilation observable in the narrative. But when he proceeds to draw conclusions from apparent contradictions we are entitled to reply that fuller information would very often clear up the difficulties which unquestionably exist. Thus the commentators on Shakespeare, after the manner of critics in general—and Biblical critics in particular—have given themselves an infinity of trouble over the name of Falstaff's tailor. That name was Dombledon. They have devised various readings. They have altered it into Doubledone, and have interpreted it as meaning that he was accustomed to charge twice as much as he ought. The simple explanation is, that among the Cotswold Hills, where the scene is laid, there is a hill of that name. It is by no means impossible that, if we could recover the full details of the history of Israel, we should be in possession of many a 'plain tale 'which would be sufficient to 'put down' a large number of the elaborate objections upon which modern theories have

been founded.

But we must allow the Professor to speak for himself. This is the way in which he treats the history in Joshua x.:

'An example on a larger scale is supplied by the two accounts of the conquest of Canaan, and especially of southern Canaan. According to Josh. x. the conquest of all southern Canaan from Gibeon

to Kad Joshua diately was co alive. not by the na campa Yet th Debir, by Jos in deta differe the con of Jos the co carried of Jos fought swept their v that b overru and od tion; in the their 1 43-45 origina artifici death Judg. version less ar conqu single accoun sphere to whi (pp. 1;

to the consp school meet. Robe we geffect

71), he

id pro-

to pre-

rk that

on the

hat the

willing

ks not

tion in

sumed,

ba' in

hereas

rred to.

ethites

vhereas

to Kadesh-Barnea was effected in a single campaign, undertaken by Joshua in person at the head of the united forces of all Israel, immediately after the defeat of the five kings before Gibeon. The conquest was complete, for the enemy was exterminated, not a soul being left alive. But according to Judges i. the land of Judah was conquered, not by all Israel under Joshua, but by Judah and Simeon alone. As the narrative now stands we learn from Judges i. I that the separate campaign of Judah and Simeon took place after the death of Joshua. Yet the events of the campaign included the taking of Hebron and Debir, which, according to the other account, had been already taken by Joshua, and their inhabitants utterly destroyed. The difference in details is insuperable; but still more important is the fundamental difference between the two accounts as regards the whole method of the conquest. In Judges i. (with which agree certain isolated passages of Joshua that stand out very clearly from the surrounding narrative) the conquest of Canaan is represented as a very gradual process, carried out by each tribe fighting for its own hand; whereas the Book of Joshua depicts a series of great campaigns in which all Israel fought as a united host, with the result that the Canaanites were swept out of existence through the greater part of the country, and their vacant lands divided by lot among the tribes. It is impossible that both these accounts can be correct. If Joshua had merely overrun the country, the serious work of driving out the Canaanites and occupying their land might have remained for the next generation; but the account in Joshua excludes any such view, and says in the strongest way that the Canaanites were exterminated, and their lands occupied peaceably (see especially Josh. x. xi. and xxi.

Plainly here we have two accounts of the conquest, which were originally quite distinct, and have been united only in the most artificial manner by the note of time ("and it came to pass after the death of Joshua") which has been inserted by a later hand in Judge. i. I. Of the two accounts that in Judges is the true historical version, while the other has this characteristic mark of a later and less authoritative narrative, that it gathers up all the details of slow conquest and local struggle in one comprehensive picture with a single hero in the foreground. In precisely the same way the later accounts of the establishment of the Saxons in England extend the sphere of Hengest's original conquests far beyond the narrow region to which they are confined by older and more authentic tradition'

(pp. 130-2).

We remark, by the way, that there is some approach here to the method of comparative historical criticism which is so conspicuously absent from every other author of the critical school with whose works it has been our good fortune to meet. There is little enough of it in the writings of Professor Robertson Smith. Even there we must be thankful for what we get. His criticism, however, would have been more effective if he had told us what later accounts of Hengest's

dibility gh, the t when dictions d very exist. manner — have ame of y have

Double-

accus-

simple

ere the

means

the his-

'plain

number

es have

himself.

ounts of

n. Ac-

Gibeon

a x.:

1892

original conquests extend them beyond 'the narrow region' to which more authentic traditions confine them. The extent of the various kingdoms of the Heptarchy has been generally supposed to have been pretty clearly marked out from the first. No account that we know of claiming in any way to be authentic history has attributed to Hengest such a conquest of Britain as that universally believed to have been achieved by Joshua in Palestine until critical solvents came to be applied to the narrative. The later accounts of the conquests of Britain, too, we must be permitted to remind the Professor, have not ascribed it to a single hero. The settlements in Northumbria, East Anglia, and Wessex have consistently been ascribed to other leaders, and not to Hengest. Thus we cannot admit that the conquests of Hengest have been exaggerated in 'precisely the same way' as those of Joshua are supposed to have been. That there is an apparent contradiction between the narratives in Joshua and Judges may very readily be admitted. But it appears to have escaped the Professor that the narrative in Judges represents the conquest as having already taken place, and the territory as having already been parcelled out. The 'older and more authentic tradition' (Judg. i. 3) speaks of Judah's lot, as well as that of Simeon.1 Something at least of the kind related in Josh. x. must therefore have already occurred, and it is far more probable that in this chapter the completeness of Joshua's conquest may have been somewhat exaggerated, and that the slackness of the various tribes after his death had permitted the Canaanites to repossess themselves of some of the conquered territory, than that we are to conceive of the details of Joshua's victories to have been Chauvinistic fictions, invented by the Israelites at a later date to glorify their national hero and themselves.2 If some such conquest did not take place,

We crave pardon. The word 'lot,' thus twice introduced, is clearly, according to all the 'recognized laws of literary and historical criticism,' an interpolation from the 'later and less authoritative narrative,' just as we are informed the words 'after the death of Joshua' are. It is extraordinary how easily all difficulties are solved by thus cutting the Gordian knot.

how of th invas to th Profe puzz easy over toric coun astor have remo relig Asia came nion com duri him, sistil narr an ' as di Jeho

are
occu
selve
the
that
fell in
It is
comp
tives
part
comp
narra
have

credi

incre

more

repu

(1 5

circu

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> We may add that the narrative of Joshua x. itself does not represent anything approaching to a conquest of the entire territory of Judah. Jerusalem itself was untouched, and Hebron and Debir were only two among the many cities in that portion of Palestine. And as to the difficulty about extermination, we may remember how the Britons are said to have been slaughtered by the Saxons. And yet it appears clear from the names of places and rivers that many must have been enslaved. Moreover, the narative in Joshua x. may reasonably be held to take no account of those who escaped from the slaughter. The only object of the writer is to show

Oct.

gion'

xtent

erally

n the

ay to

con-

been

came

of the

mind

The

have

ngest.

have

se of

arent

udges

caped

con-

ry as

more

well

elated

is far

shua's

at the

nitted

con-

ails of

ented

hero

place,

clearly,

icism,' just as

extra-

ordian

present

Jeru-

among y about e been

mes of

ne nar-

se who

o show

how was Palestine parcelled out at all? Is the whole story of the Exodus a myth? Are we to believe that successive invasions of different Israelitish tribes took place at different times, and that the conquest of Israel was really analogous to the conquest of Britain by Jutes, Saxons, and English? Professor Smith has given us no solution of the historical puzzle, and his methods may serve to show how much more easy it is to suggest difficulties than to explain them. Moreover the history of Joshua, as it stands, has innumerable historical parallels. From Rameses II. to Napoleon we have countless instances of great commanders who have achieved astonishing successes, and have founded vast empires, which have fallen to pieces as soon as their moral ascendency was removed. The nearest parallel is the burst of military and religious enthusiasm which carried the Arab banners across Asia and Africa into Europe. But the inevitable reaction came at last, and effeminacy and sloth broke up the dominion which energy and valour had acquired. It is almost a commonplace of history how 'the people served the Lord during the days of Joshua and of the elders that outlived' him, and how, when 'another generation arose,' the old irresistible impulse was felt to have passed away.

Another kind of difficulty is suggested in regard to the narrative in I Sam. viii-xi. This is divided (pp. 135-7) into an 'older story' which regards the institution of the kingship as divinely ordained, and a 'meagre skeleton,' which regards Jehovah as hostile to kingly government. The older narrative, moreover, represents Saul as ignorant of the character and reputation of Samuel (1 Sam. ix. 6), whereas the later one (I Sam. vii. 15-17) regards him as having gone about in circuit in Saul's own neighbourhood judging Israel. There are two points, the one literary, the other historical, which occur to us, which do not appear to have suggested themselves to the objector. The first is the curious way in which the older narrative is imbedded in the other, without any that Joshua obeyed the orders he had received, and spared none who fell into his hands. Another point, too, should not escape our notice. It is very easy to solve apparent contradictions by the assumption that a compiler combined excerpts from two different and inconsistent narratives. But not only does this théory assume the utmost stupidity on the part of the compiler, and of all the people who swallowed his clumsy compilation, but it ignores the fact that if we had the whole of the narratives before us from which these compilations were made, we should have the inconsistencies which the theory presupposes before us in a far

more glaring form. Thus the stupidity of the compiler and the blind

credulity of the Jewish people in general would of necessity be indefinitely

increased.

18

an

no

(p.

reg

pro

no

we

Sci

the

Cooreli

His

sha

not

allo

he a

betw

exac

refer

contradiction, apparently, having been perceived by the 'redactor.' That he might have carelessly placed certain portions of the two inconsistent narratives side by side without having perceived their incongruity is quite possible. But that after having inserted the second narrative he should have returned again to the first, and have again described Samuel as strongly opposed to this new departure in Israelite history is, to say the least, surprising.1 The second consideration is, that we are at a loss to conceive at what period of Israelite history subsequent to Samuel any history can have been written, of which the redactor availed himself, which took a view opposed to kingly government. Professor Smith gives us no assistance. Nor is it at all easy to fix such a period, the more especially as this 'later' view appears to have been thoroughly accepted by the earliest prophet recognized by modern criticism. 'I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath' (Hos. xiii. 11), is a passage which appears to have been overlooked by the Professor in his doubtless able statement of the difficulties involved in the Scripture narrative.2 It seems, on the whole, safer to imagine that the main facts were actually as we have them recorded.

It is somewhat difficult to select particular portions of Professor Smith's powerful work for examination. We are at issue with him on most of the important points which he has raised in regard to the origin of the Mosaic Law. He accepts the theory of the sources of the Pentateuch with which English readers have been made familiar by Professor Driver's Introduction. In spite of the universal tradition of the Jews he insists on connecting the Book of Joshua with the Pentateuch, rather than with the histories that follow (p. 227). He believes that the Three Codes are far removed from one

show Ezra histo the li of it a res Levit Tora system find to obsoli Toral law fo till the

set for W

The a

to us.

hande

cinct a and cer have b some p

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The fact appears to have been forgotten that in what has been supposed to be the later narrative Samuel is expressly told by Jehovah (I Sam. viii. 7-9) to grant the request of the people for a king. Thus chap. ix. is only a natural continuation of the narrative in chap. viii. The fact is that in a history simply and inartistically constructed, such as those in the Old Testament, if ingenuity desires to manufacture contradictions it is easy enough to do so.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The most difficult thing to explain is Saul's ignorance of Samuel, whereas he was actually judging Israel in that time in Saul's own neighbourhood. It is to be feared, however, that the age of Saul was not what they one in which young men have been found to be ignorant of what they ought and might be expected to know. And not only were the functions of the judges confined to a limited area, but the personal character of the judge might very easily be less well known than his office. We are also told (I Sam. viii. I) that Samuel had retired from public life when the incidents happened which are recorded in chap. ix.

Oct.

the

ain

out

3ut

ave

uel

ory

is,

lite

een

k a

ives

iod,

een

by

and

sage or in

the

gine

led.

ns of

are

h he

He

hich

ver's

lews

enta-

He

one

n sup-

hovah

Thus

s those

ictions

amuel,

neighnot the

f what

ere the

ersonal

nan his ed from ap. ix.

another in time. Like Professor Ryle, he regards Deuteronomy as having been written after the time of Isaiah, to whom (p. 355) it was 'not known,' though, as we have seen, he regards the idea that Hilkiah forged it as 'effectually disproved' (p. 363). He thinks (p. 420) that it can be 'proved' not to be 'historical fact' that 'the ordinances of Judaism, as we know them from Ezra downwards, already existed and were enforced in the days of Moses,' although he admits that the Scriptures in their present shape declare such to have been the case. He accepts the post-exilic origin of the Priestly Code, which he regards as the final issue of the sketch of religious legislation suggested during the exile by Ezekiel.1 His view of the position of Ezekiel in relation to the ultimate shaping out of the priestly Torah is ingenious and striking, if not altogether conclusive. On this point, however, we will allow him to state, in his own words, the conclusion at which he arrives:

The development of the details of the system falls therefore between the time of Ezekiel and the work of Ezra, or, to speak exactly, between 572 and 444 B.C.; and the circumstance already referred to, that the culminating and most solemn ceremony of the great day of expiation was not observed in the year of Ezra's covenant shows that the last touches were not added to the ritual until, through Ezra's agency, it was put into practical operation. But while the historical student is thus compelled to speak of the ritual code as the law of the second Temple, it would be a great mistake to think of it as altogether new. Ezekiel's ordinances are nothing else than a reshaping of the old priestly Torah; and a close study of the Levitical laws, especially in Lev. xvii.-xxvi., shows that many ancient Torahs are worked up, by successive processes, into the complete system as we now possess it. In Lev. xxiv. 19 sq., for example, we find the old law of retaliation for injuries not mortal, which is already obsolescent in the Deuteronomic Code. The preservation of such a Torah shows that the priests did not give up all their old traditional law for the written Code of Deuteronomy. They doubtless continued till the time of Ezra to give oral Torahs, as we see from Haggai i. 11. The analogy of all early law makes this procedure quite intelligible to us. Nothing is more common than to find an antique legislation handed down, in the mouth of a priestly or legal guild, in certain set forms of words ' (pp. 382, 383).

We shall leave to Professor Robertson the task of dealing with these historical theories, remarking however, by the way,

VOL. XXXV.-NO. LXIX.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> His expression of opinion regarding the story of the altar is succinct and a little dogmatic. It, together with Judges xx., is 'post-priestly and certainly not historical' (p. 413). But in that case the story must have been a deliberate invention. We surely are entitled to demand some proof of this.

that it would have been more satisfactory if Professor Robertson Smith had given some instances of a practice which he declares to be so common. We shall confine ourselves to one or two observations on the spirit in which his investigations are carried on. As a rule it is admirable. Yet now and then his usual candour and courtesy appear for a moment to desert Thus he is not quite fair to his antagonists when (p. 127) he describes them as determined 'to acquiesce in what they have received by tradition,' because 'internal evidence is notoriously uncertain and delusive.' The objection which has been taken by all the more reasonable thinkers to the conclusions of Professor Robertson Smith and his school does not rest upon opposition to all critical inquiry. They simply 'refuse to believe' what they are told simply because they are told it. They do not choose to be informed that 'Hupfeld has proved' this, Wellhausen that, and Stade the other, and then to be bidden to hold their tongues and accept what is given them, under pain of being 'put out of the synagogue' of scholars. They are ready to admit that the traditional theory may possibly require revision. But they do declare that the argument from internal evidence is uncertain, and that its results require to be stated with diffidence, and accepted with reserve. They are far more likely, however, to listen to Professor Robertson Smith than any other writer of the critical school, because he, at least, does give his reasons for the statements he makes. But even he has no right to misrepresent the attitude of those who are unconvinced by his reasoning. He has no right to represent them as asserting that 'Moses wrote the Pentateuch '(p. 327) because they are unable to perceive the cogency of arguments which declare the moral and ceremonial law to have assumed its present form as late as Ezra. It is worthy of note, moreover, that the only occasions on which he seems inclined to lose his temper are in connexion with this theory of the late development of the Law. Thus we read, on p. 325, the abrupt assertion: 'As a matter of fact the Pentateuchal history was written in the land of Canaan.' And we are further sternly admonished that if we venture to talk about the insertions of an editor 'without internal evidence that they are in a different style, or break the context,' we shall 'raise' a 'potent spirit' which 'will tell us a good deal more than' we 'shall be willing to hear.' We ought, no doubt, to be much alarmed at such a threat. But one is a little comforted by the reflection that there are a good many passages ascribed to the 'Priestly Code' and the 'Redactor' on no better evidence than we have for the theory of later editorial

or as no ne De

to

wit

a

(I

in

" V

Sm ext with of the tion And the facu a m Gern at the versy comp

in the doub 'so f book indee feat to nounce sistem as 'ha goes 'ttions.'

must st

ct.

rt-

he

ne

ons

nen

ert

hen

in

evi-

tion s to

loor

hey

ause

that

the

cept

yna-

radi-

y do

tain,

and

er, to

er of

as for

epre-

ning.

Moses

o per-

al and

Ezra.

which

th this

read,

Penta-

nd we

about e that

e shall

al more

oubt, to

le comassages

on no

ditorial

additions. Again, Professor Sayce is somewhat roughly told (p. 245) that a statement he makes 'is due to haste or ignorance.' Even the eminent scholar Dillmann, is annihilated in p. 393 by a 'really?' although it is tolerably clear that the 'whole system' of Deuteronomy may as easily be said to rest on the 'cardinal Priestly Code doctrine of the one sanctuary' as the converse, and that if agreement on this one point does not prevent Deuteronomy from ignoring the Priestly Code, neither does it prevent the Priestly Code from ignoring Deuteronomy.

We come now to Professor Robertson, who has been daring enough to maintain the traditional view of Israelitish history in these days when 'it has been conclusively demonstrated' to be wrong. It must be confessed that he is not altogether without qualifications for his task. Like Professor Robertson Smith, he has resided in Palestine, and is therefore to some extent acquainted with the Oriental mind. He is familiar with Hebrew and the kindred languages. He has some idea of the nature of an argument, and has some acquaintance with the 'ordinary laws of historical investigation,' qualifications so strangely rare in the members of the critical school. And, above all, he has another qualification without which the eloquence of Demosthenes combined with the reasoning faculty of Newton or Laplace would not in these days entitle a man to a hearing—he is well acquainted with the latest German literature in the department of Biblical criticism.

Professor Robertson, with true Scotch caution, takes care at the outset to disencumber himself of the literary controversy. His object is purely historical. Accordingly, while complimenting Professor Driver's Introduction for 'its fairness in the treatment of details, and its cautious reserve in face of doubtful or conflicting evidence,' he takes care to add that 'so far as these relate to the composition and dates of the books,' he is 'not particularly concerned with them.' He indeed goes so far as to tell us (p. 383) that 'as a literary feat the labour [of distinguishing the sources] may be pronounced on the whole successful.' But he is not quite consistent with himself on this point. He speaks of himself (p. 516) as 'having indicated doubts whether this kind of argument goes very far to determine the actual dates of the compositions.' He points out (p. 513) the different conclusions at

<sup>&#</sup>x27; He remarks also (p. 40), 'Since the critics undertake so much, we must stipulate that their criticism shall be fair. They must not criticise the books away altogether.'

which scholars have arrived. He mentions the fact (p. 514) that the Koran, though on the whole a homogeneous work, and 'uniform above most Arab works, exhibits' nevertheless 'quite a number of styles, and not a few divergent tendencies.' His support, therefore, of the critics, even on the literary question, must be regarded as of a very qualified description.

His approval of Professor Driver's work is still further qualified. He thinks it would have been 'more satisfactory' if Professor Driver, 'as König has done,' had accentuated the difference 'between himself and Wellhausen' (Preface, p. x). He regards Professor Driver's remark that 'criticism does not destroy, but presupposes' the inspiration of the Old Testament, as 'altogether inadequate' (p. xi), and as reducing the inspiration of Scripture to a level with that of a religious novel. And he asks the question which lies at the root of the whole controversy—the question whether, if these canons of the critical school be accepted, 'the historical value of Christianity would remain where it is' (p. xii).

On one important point Professor Robertson holds no uncertain language. He asserts the right of the ordinary reader to decide for himself on the questions involved, a right which of late has too often been very weakly surrendered:

'If certain books, or portions of books, for example, are rejected as unhistorical and untrustworthy, or if certain passages are declared to be interpolations or additions, the ordinary reader ought to be satisfied on what grounds this critical sifting is exercised. If he is told that this is done on scholarly grounds, of whose validity he is incapable of forming an opinion, it comes to this, that the advocate of the theory constitutes himself the judge also, and there is no case for the jury. But it may turn out that the critical processes in question are controlled by canons of whose validity the ordinary reader is quite competent to judge. Either therefore the processes themselves and the conclusions drawn from them must be entirely left aside at the outset, or else they must be able to justify themselves to the plain reason of the ordinary reader' (p. 5).

He even quotes Professor Robertson Smith's authority for the statement. The latter says that Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* 'gives the English reader for the first time an opportunity to form his own judgment on questions which are within the scope of anyone who reads the English Bible carefully, and is able to think clearly and without prejudice about its contents.' <sup>1</sup>

Professor Robertson adds:

'The essential and fundamental matters in dispute in this con-

<sup>1</sup> Wellhausen, Prolegomena, Presace, p. vi.

pur hur sen such rity cust kind beh

resp

on f

18

tro

of

ha

He

the

ISSI

are

cor

the

que

on a If you Well hims batic frequency two per two per two its irother there in the from 'crum'.

used to Pentate been co

of Holy

SO COI

.......

ct.

4)

rk,

ess

es.

es-

her

ry'

the

x).

not

sta-

the

ous

t of

ons

ris-

un-

ader hich

ected

lared

to be

he is

he is

ocate case

ques-

der is

them-

aside

to the

ty for

omena

e first

stions

Eng-

ithout

nis con-

troversy are not questions of "scholarship" at all, in the proper sense of that term. It so happens, as a matter of course, that the men who have gone most thoroughly into these questions have been trained Hebraists; but the bare facts of a linguistic character with which they have to deal count for very little in the essential questions at issue, as critical writers themselves have confessed. These writers are specialists, it is true, but specialists dealing with matters in which common sense may follow them, observe their processes, and pronounce upon their validity. Specialists are very prone to become theorists, and a specialist with a theory is a very unsafe guide when questions of evidence have to be settled. 2

And he also says: 'One indispensable qualification for pursuing an inquiry like the present is that knowledge of human nature and sympathy with it which we call common sense' (p. 8). And again he remarks that the views held on such subjects 'are of no more value if received on the authority of scholars and experts than if accepted by tradition or custom.' This fearless appeal to the common sense of mankind is the true scientific method, which never shelters itself behind authority, but challenges the fullest investigation of the arguments by which its conclusions are established.

Professor Robertson's method is scientific also in another He proposes to base his inquiry, not on theory, but Accordingly he starts with authorities undisputed on all sides, the writings of the prophets Amos and Hosea. If you have no historical authority to build upon, he cites Wellhausen as saying, 'you are like a man attempting to hoist himself into the air by his own waistband' (p. 72)—an acrobatic feat, he might have added, which German criticism has frequently attempted to achieve. But he lays down one or two postulates beforehand which it will be difficult to dispute. He remarks (p. 12) on the broad contrast between Jewish and other history. While Assyria, Egypt, Persia, Greece, have 'crumbled to ruins,' and while (p. 13) 'the Roman Empire with its iron heel trampled the Jewish nationality to the ground, there was nevertheless 'a vitality which it could not crush.' There must, he adds, have been something 'very distinctive' in the early history of a people 'to enable it to remain apart from 'other 'nationalities, great or small, and to outlast them so conspicuously.' It is this stubborn fact with which the

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Gladstone has made a similar remark in his *Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In his first supplementary note the Professor remarks how 'what used to be regarded as the earliest of the larger component parts of the Pentateuch is now made the latest, and the linguistic features have not been considered a bar to either view.'

German school of criticism has never attempted to grapple, and which it utterly fails to explain. It was the *religion* of Israel which was the cause of this uniqueness in Israelite history, and Professor Robertson cites Wellhausen and Stade as admitting that the 'national unity of Israel rested upon religious ideas.' But if the history of Israel has been so strangely unlike the history of any other nation upon earth, it follows incontrovertibly that there must have existed causes for that unlikeness. Some external influence must have impressed its peculiar religious stamp upon the Jewish people. And no satisfactory explanation has been given of the phenomena except the traditional one that God revealed Himself to Israel by Moses.

As Professor Robertson says: 'It will be required of the modern theory that it give a better account of the facts of the case, and present on the whole a more consistent and credible explanation of the things that are not matters of dispute' (p. 32).

'The Biblical historians say "We write thus because thus things occurred." If the anti-Biblical historians say "Things did not so occur," they are bound, among other things, to give a reasonable explanation why the Biblical historians so wrote. In a general way we may contrast the two theories thus: the modern theory undertakes to trace the development of the religion from the lowest stages of animistic worship up to ethic monotheism, and from custom up to authorized divine law, and this too within the period distinctively embraced within the history of Israel as a people. The Biblical theory also posits a development, but the essential things which were finally reached—a belief in a moral Deity, the one Ruler of the world, and a law divinely given—are there in germ and substance to start with at the threshold of the nation's life. There are low stages

Professor Robertson now sets himself to prove from Amos and Hosea, first, that their writings are distinct evidence that Israel possessed a high literary, and, next, a high moral and religious, development at the time when they wrote, and that these unquestionable facts compel us to carry the literary and religious history of Israel a great deal further back than the critical school is willing to allow.\(^1\) He shows first of all, from the recent discovery in Egypt\(^2\) of a number of cuneiform tablets,

of belief, there are customs rising into laws, on both theories. The

difference lies in the place assigned to them.'

And again:

The of hold the us closii.

exi

inn

fort

and

18

th

Da

A

po

rel

COI

his

de

an

as

pre Ho (Ar pro rite (p. from geri mus

Jud test voic of '

befo

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In relation to this, Professor Robertson (p. 136) quotes the words of Emerson to Walt Whitman: 'I greet you at the beginning of a great career, which yet must have had a long foreground somewhere for such a start.'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> At Tell-el-Amarna.

ct.

ole,

of

ite

ade

on

SO

rth,

ses

im-

ple.

no-

f to

the

the

ible

32).

ings

t so

able

way

der-

ages

p to

ively lical

were

the

ce to

tages

The

mos

that

and

that

and

the

from

blets,

rds of

great r such

that good schools existed throughout Western Asia before the Exodus. He points out that stirring times like those of David must necessarily have produced a national literature. And he further shows that the contents of Amos and Hosea postulate a definitely understood religious development, with religious ideas and a corresponding religious vocabulary, for a considerable period before they wrote. In examining the history of the schools of the prophets he regards the dancing dervish theory which Stade and Wellhausen have promulgated, and which Professor Ryle has shown a disposition to accept, as nothing short of a 'miserable travesty of the accounts which

lie before us' (p. 89).

He then proceeds to trace the history of these bands. They existed—unless we are to resort to the expedient here of regarding these stories, with Stade, as the 'favourite hobby' of 'dilettanti' students of Holy Writ, and to treat them as later additions—in the days of Samuel. They meet us again in the days of Ahab (I Kings xx. 35); they are closely bound up with the story of Elijah and Elisha (2 Kings ii. I-7, 25, vi.); they were anointed to their office (I Kings xix. 16); and they lived together in communities (2 Kings iv. 38-44). And then he proceeds (p. 94): 'If we admit the existence of these so-called schools at all, we must give the inmates something to do connected with the religion and fortunes of the nation.' And he ascribes the 'sudden appearance of finished literary composition,' which the analytic criticism assumes—if it be indeed a fact—to the previous activity of these bodies.

Then he proceeds to draw conclusions in regard to the previous history of Israel from the writings of Amos and Hosea. 'Is it not so, O house of Israel?' the former says (Amos ii. 11), referring to the forty years' wanderings, the prophets raised up by Jehovah, and the institution of Nazarites as facts as well known to his hearers as to himself. Hosea (p. 110) clearly regards the Israel of his day as one people from the time of the Exodus downwards, and not as a congeries of 'contiguous and related tribes.' Clearly, then, he must have had the main features of the history of Israel before him in the same shape as that in which it has come down to us. Amos, again (p. 111), comes from the south of Judah to testify against Israel. How does he commence his 'Jehovah shall roar from Zion and utter His testimony? voice from Jerusalem' (Amos i. 2). He speaks (ch. ix. 11) of 'raising up the tabernacle of David which is fallen,' and of 'building it up as in the days of old.' His language is inex-

189

po

tha

ear

sin

wa

pet

and

and

and

the

of .

leg

crit

apa

the

We

lege

volv

is '

a 'f

Isaa

hist

preh

W

nom

rema

may

upon

suppe

taine

forget the cl

which

that i

selves

such

any

preco

critic: denou

Robe

plicable except on the theory of a national unity founded on the basis of a national religion. Hosea, himself an Israelite, prophesies the rejection of Israel and the pardon of Judah (ch. i. 6, 7). So again (ch. iv. 15) he hints at special privileges which render the offence of Judah more serious than that of Israel. Again, both prophets most strongly corroborate the theory of the history as it stands, that God had brought the people out of Egypt, had bestowed on them special religious privileges, and that they had been ungrateful and rebellious. 'You only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore will I punish you for your iniquities' (Amos iii. 2). Hosea 'represents Israel now as the wife of Jahaveh who had been unfaithful to her husband (i. 2, &c.), and again as a tenderly reared son who was bent to backsliding' (xi. 7) (p. 113). 'By a prophet Jehovah brought Israel out of Egypt, and by a prophet was he preserved' (Hos. xii. 13). The ministry of the prophets (Hos. xii. 10) had been continuous towards Israel, and had been in vain. Nay, it is even true that Israel has fallen far more seriously than Judah, and will meet with a severer punishment.1 'I take it, then,' says Professor Robertson, in summing up this part of his argument, 'that the views of Israel's past history given by the prophets of the eighth century were the views entertained by the nation generally at that time . . . and so far as reference is made to actual occurrences in the history, the prophets are at one with the historians' (p.

Passing from the contents of the earlier prophets to the so-called 'Jehovistic' narratives, which the analytical criticism assigns to the same age, Professor Robertson (p. 122) quotes Wellhausen as declaring that even these narratives, so far as they refer to the patriarchs, belong to the time when 'Israel had become a powerful kingdom, Moab, Ammon, and Edom had been subjugated, and vigorous frontier wars had been carried on with the Syrians.' 2 This statement is based on Gen. xxvii. 29, 40, xxxi. 52. It will be observed, of course, that according to Wellhausen all the prophecies were necessarily written after the event. Professor Robertson advises the ordinary reader, unless he is prepared submissively to accept all that 'scholars tell us,' 'to consult the passages above mentioned,' and 'form his own judgment whether Wellhausen can see further into a millstone than himself.' He quotes Maurice Vernes, whose 'confidence in his own

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Hos. i. 7, 11, xi. 8, 9; Amos ii. 4, ix. 11.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Hist. Isr. p. 464, footnote.

ct.

on te,

ah vi-

an o-

ad

em

te-

our

as

nd

ent

ah

re-

OS.

in

ore sh-

ing

ast

the

the

(p.

the

riti-

22)

, so

hen

and

had

ased

irse,

ces-

rises

y to

ages

ther

self.

own

power' to read between the lines of history is not less than that of Wellhausen, as assigning these events to a period not earlier than the Captivity. He remarks caustically on the singular form of a legend which symbolizes 'vigorous frontier wars' under the figure of a cairn erected to preserve perpetual peace. He asks if the nation 'knew nothing' of Jacob and his connexion with Mesopotamia before these wars arose, and how it was that these 'legends' were appealed to by Hosea and Amos to 'point the moral of their prophecies.' He further considers himself as entitled to demand why the history of a well-known nation should have been so dressed up in legend, and how, though it is 'conclusively proved' on the critical theory to refer 'to events quite isolated and even far apart in time and place,' it can manage 'to hold so well together as a family history' (p. 123). Then he remarks how Wellhausen's sweeping assertion that 'in the patriarchal legend the ethnographic element is always predominant 'involves him in difficulty at the very outset. Abraham, he admits, is 'somewhat difficult to interpret.' He regards Abraham as a 'free creation of unconscious art,' evolved subsequently to Isaac. But Professor Robertson very naturally asks how the history or 'legend' of Isaac could possibly have been comprehensible without that of his father. And he adds (p. 126), 'Who was this J. or E. who could so accurately describe nomad life that had long passed away?' And he further remarks:

'There is a temptation, which is very seductive, to adopt what may be called a nebular hypothesis of early history. Having fixed upon what we consider the earliest historical period, we are apt to suppose that the succession of the race before that period was maintained by existences of a nebular, unformed, half-human character, forgetting that it is only the distance of our standpoint that makes the characters indistinct. Could we get near enough to the age in which Abraham is placed by the Biblical writers, we should discover that it was an age of human beings of parts and passions like ourselves, for that matter; and, at all events, of individuals very much such as these writers depict' (pp. 131, 132).

In pp. 146–148 he deals with the attempts to show that any passages in Amos and Hosea which conflict with the preconceived notions of the critics are interpolations. Interpolations, it may be remarked, are as freely presupposed by the critics when they happen to suit them, as they are sternly denounced <sup>1</sup> when they do not happen to suit them. Professor Robertson shows that the theory of interpolation makes non-

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 3.

sense of the passages in which it is supposed to exist, and proceeds as follows:

'The position in which we are now placed is this. The modern historians have refused to call the books of the Pentateuch as evidence; they have eliminated those "summaries" of the history which are overlaid on the historical books; they triumphantly appeal to contemporary witnesses, and we have accepted them. And then, when their own witnesses step into the box, and are expected to bless the modern theory, they curse it altogether. And this by no forced cross-examination on the part of those who were to be confuted by them, but by spontaneous straightforward statements, and forthwith those who called them proceed to tell us that the evidence is to be taken with reservation. For later additions have been made to the testimony, and these must be removed before we can get the true statement of the case. Nay, these prophets themselves, even when we get at their own words, are not to be relied on for matters of fact when they tell us that other teachers taught the same truth before them, nor for their statements of history when they declare that their nation had been taught a better religion and had declined from it. The question again recurs, Where now is the fixed point and firm standard by which we are to reach the truth? The historical books are to be corrected by the aid of the prophetical; but where is the standard for correcting the prophetical books? On what authority are these "insertions" to be removed? By what guide are we to adjust the prophetic misapprehensions? The only "fixed" thing perceivable is the theory itself, the only standard is "strike out" or "I consider." For the rest, what may be called by admirers a delicate process of criticism may appear to others uncommonly like a piece of literary thimblerigging. You come upon the critic suddenly when he professes to be engaged in one of those delicate processes of criticism, and you find him slipping his subjective scale up his sleeve. The passages which disturb a pet theory are declared to disturb the connexion. We have, in fact, no contemporary reliable documents till the critic has adjusted them, and the theory ultimately is appealed to in confirmation of itself' (pp. 149, 150).

Professor Robertson Smith's utterances in regard to canonization are next referred to, and the 'confidence' with which he and other critics 'set to work on their task' is duly admired. 'It is not needful,' says Professor Robertson Smith, 'to lay down in starting any fixed rules of procedure. The ordinary laws of evidence and good sense must be our guides.' Certainly, his brother professor mildly replies. Only we have not yet quite settled what are 'the ordinary laws of evidence and good sense.' There is in all this criticism a convenient habit of assuming as a matter of course that the 'ordinary laws' of historical and literary criticism,

of sui

Ro

the Jal the WO sel at for of bec wit of 1 was tute fou in t to t duc ing stro whe alre whi idea as thos ploy add of t a ne to a erec was does this by o the

Kue

imag

as to

sion

Oct.

and

lern

evi-

tory

hen,

d to

y no

con-

and

ence

nade

t the

even

truth

lined

point

histo-

; but

what

only ard is

ed by

s un-

upon

those

s sub-

theory

con-

n, and

p. 149,

rd to

' with

sk' is

ertson

edure.

be our

eplies.

dinary

s criti-

course

ticism,

On

of evidence and good sense, are precisely those which it suits the critic at the moment to lay down.

We must not stop to remark at any length on Professor Robertson's learned and closely-reasoned investigations into the origin of the name Jehovah-or as he prefers to call it. Jahaveh-into the doctrine about His dwelling-place; into the relation of the original religion of Israel to Molochworship, fire-worship and the like. We must content ourselves with a brief abstract of his reasoning, which must at least be admitted to furnish us with excellent reasons for doubting whether the development theory of the religion of Israel has been quite so 'conclusively proved' as it has become the fashion to assert. Professor Robertson first deals with the assertion that Jehovah was originally, in the belief of Israel, a mere tribal god, and that the sphere of His activity was limited to the land of which He was supposed to be the tutelar guardian. He shows that there is absolutely no foundation for Wellhausen's off-hand statement that Jehovah in the song of Deborah, is 'summoned to come from Sinai' to the aid of His oppressed people. He meets a similar deduction from certain expressions in David's history, by showing that expressions of the same character, only a good deal stronger, are to be found in Deuteronomy, a book written when, according to our theorists, the 'ethic monotheism' had already been developed. He admires the ingenuity with which the names of places are dealt with so as to favour the idea that the religion of Israel had an animistic origin, as well as the 'peculiar manipulation of the "sources" to which those who maintain it resort (p. 205). Their habit of 'employing discredited works to build up their own theory,' he adds, with quaint humour, reminds him of nothing so much as of the 'Irish Board of Guardians who resolved first to build a new workhouse out of the materials of the old, and secondly, to allow the old workhouse to stand till the new one was erected.' Then he deals with Kuenen's assertion that ' Jahveh was worshipped in the shape of a young bull.' Of course he does not deny what the Bible narrative expressly asserts, that this tendency was a prevalent one in Israel. But he shows by careful investigation (pp. 221-9) that it was not 'part of the authorized Mosaic Jahaveh religion.' He even quotes Kuenen himself<sup>2</sup> as admitting that Moses did not 'promote' image worship. He also deals with the remarkable argument as to the character of Israelite worship drawn from the allusion to human sacrifices in Micah vi. 6, 7, but he does not hit

1 Religion of Israel, i. 235.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 289.

upon the obvious reply that these words are placed by the prophet in the mouth of a heathen monarch. It is unnecessary, we repeat, to follow him in his refutation of the various wild and visionary theories of the origin of the name of Jehovah. But his examination of the course of development of the religion of Israel from a 'circumscribed national monolatry' to the 'ethic monotheism' of the prophets put forth by Kuenen in his Hibbert Lectures for 1882, is fair, and, to us at least, convincing. He admits that Kuenen's analysis of the facts possesses 'much truth and suggestiveness' (p. 311). But he utterly denies that the prophetic idea of Jahaveh was reached by the processes to which Kuenen attributes He pours some felicitous ridicule on the hypothesis that a "conception" of the world was introduced by the Assyrians,' that at the presence of this conception the 'petty nationalities' of the world lost their 'centre of gravity;' that 'the prophets of Israel alone did not allow themselves to be taken by surprise,' but "absorbed" in their religion this conception 'while the 'centre of gravity' of the nation at large was still 'lost.' He asks why the prophets of Israel took a different view. But here, at the very root of the whole question, the oracle, at other times so voluble, is obstinately silent. From these inquiries into what 'must have happened,' with which the unfortunate Biblical inquirers of our day are so painfully familiar, he comes to facts. He shows that within the range of written prophecy, from Amos to Jeremiah, there is literally no trace of a development of the Jahaveh idea. This might be supposed by men of ordinary minds to be fatal to the theory. But the development school are, here as always, quite equal to the occasion. Wellhausen and Stade resort to the somewhat clumsy expedient of rejecting as interpolations all the passages in which the higher idea of Jahaveh is presented by Amos. But Professor Robertson Smith disdains such commonplace methods. His own course, however, must be regarded as characterized more by inventive genius than by that adherence to the laws of evidence and common sense' by which he professes to be guided. They are 'lyrical intermezzi,' such as are frequently to be found in the second Isaiah. After this we trust we shall never be told that the 'higher criticism' is without an 'answer to the most formidable objections which can be brought against it.

hist to d mar exp adm us ( book book

1892

is th a bl gath are r circu are trace form Mos all t alleg ascri of E with from of M the r tutio subje been he " consi being enact aside tion, make

in a g proph condu as con proph whom norm

found

Prophets of Israel, p. 398 ff. The expression is Wellhausen's. But Professor Robertson regards his brother professor as having practically accepted it.

Oct.

the

ces-

ous

of

ent

no-

by

us

s of

11).

veh

utes

esis

the

etty

that

o be

this

arge

ok a

ues-

lent.

with

e so

ithin

here

idea.

fatal

e as

tade

nter-

aveh

dis-

how-

ntive

and

They

never

iswer

ought

But

tically

On the question of the Three Codes, the whole religious history of Israel depends. Professor Robertson endeavours to determine this, not by à priori theories, not by an ingenious manipulation and exaggeration of the difficulties we may expect to find in ancient documents, but by appealing to admitted facts. 'Though the Hebrew writers,' he reminds us (p. 333), 'do not say anything as to who wrote the lawbooks, they assert positively that the law laid down in those books is Mosaic.' And he adds:

'It occurs at once as a striking thing that the uniform tradition is that Moses gave laws and ordinances to Israel. And that it is not a blind ascription of everything to some great ancestor may be gathered from the fact that there are ordinances and customs which are not traced to him. The Sabbath is made as old as the Creation; circumcision is a mark of the covenant with Abraham; sacrifices are pre-Mosaic; and the abstaining from the sinew that shrank is traced to the time of Jacob. The body of laws, however, that formed the constitution of Israel as a people is invariably referred to There must be some historical basis for the mere fact that all the three successive codes, as they are called-dating, as is alleged, from periods separated from one another by centuries-are ascribed to Moses, whereas another alleged code, found in the Book of Ezekiel, never obtained authoritative recognition. The persistence with which it is represented that law, moral and ceremonial, came from Moses, and the acceptance of the laws by the whole people as of Mosaic origin, proves at least that it was a deeply-seated belief in the nation that the great leader had given some formal legal constitution to his people. It seems to me that it is trifling with a great subject to say, in the same breath, that Moses could scarcely have been even the author of the whole of the Decalogue, and also that he "was regarded as the great lawgiver, and all laws which God was considered to have sanctioned were placed under his name, that being the regular and only method of conferring authority upon new enactments." The testimony of a nation is not to be so lightly set aside: it is the work of criticism to explain and account for tradition, not to give it the lie. And all the circumstances of the time make it abundantly probable that the tradition rests upon some good foundation '(pp. 335, 336).

## And again:

'From the whole tone of the prophetical literature we may argue in a general way that there was in the times of the earliest writing prophets a universal recognition of a well-known norm or rule of conduct as possessed by the nation, though sadly dishonoured as far as concerns its observance. The attitude of reproof taken up by the prophets, and the absence of gainsaying on the part of the people whom they addressed, proved the recognition of some authoritative norm lying at the threshold of the nation's history, according to the

principles laid down by St. Paul (Rom. iii. 20), that through the law is the knowledge of sin, and (v. 13) that sin is not imputed where there is no law' (p. 340).

He points out once more that Hosea viii. 12, which Well-hausen ingeniously attempts to explain away, distinctly indicates that the law was in his time believed to have been written in countless precepts, and that these precepts were

supposed to possess a divine authority (p. 342).

We must refer our readers to the book itself for Professor Robertson's minute examination of the modern theories regarding the relative date of the Three Codes. We must content ourselves with briefly mentioning his conclusions. He thinks (p. 383) that 'the difficulties of the critical theory increase at every step when the attempt is made to determine the origin of the Codes, and their relation to one another and the history. He shows how 'no formal sanction was given by prophetic men before Josiah's time to a multiplicity of sanctuaries in the sense in which the modern writers speak' (p. 405). He denies (p. 406) that such a thing was ever formally recognized by the nation. And he points out how, even in what is admitted to be by far the earliest of the Three Codes, the so-called 'Book of the Covenant' (i.e. Exod. xx.-xxiii. with chap. xxxiv.) 'the ideal is that of a central sanctuary.' His conclusion is stated as follows:

'I think, therefore, it is not proved that the book of the Covenant allows worship at any indefinite number of places as co-ordinate sanctuaries; nor does the history show that this was recognized by the religious leaders of the nation. Previous to the building of the Temple at Jerusalem, and especially when the ark was removed from Shiloh, we find what may be called a freer or less regulated practice; and this was the result of the exigencies of the period. But from the erection of the Temple, not only is there no proof that any other sanctuary was allowed, but there are positive indications that that was regarded as the one authoritative place of worship in the sense in which we here speak. The practice in the northern kingdom proves nothing, for all the assertions of modern writers to the effect that the history mainly evolved itself there, and that the kingdom of Judah counts for little, are opposed to the spirit and distinct utterances of the earliest prophets. Not less are they inconsistent with the earliest legislation. The book of the Covenant, at whatever time written, and whether composed in the northern or southern kingdom, makes no distinction between the two, and lays down one law for all Israel. The schism of the ten tribes was a breaking away from national unity and from the national God, and no proof can be adduced that prophetic men looked with anything

1 History of Israel, p. 57.

sout

1892

subj

mak The theo it ag held in re lates man requi who Old ' cesse Chris of the same volur one f histo the se given backy

> called inspir credil which by the worth accep that th the o ordina give u and re a fair author presen repres

> ordina

contro

[]

it ne

exam

that 1

but disfavour on the idolatrous worship that was practised in the southern kingdom, whether at Jerusalem or at local sanctuaries' (pp. 412, 413).

In the place of an analysis of his concluding chapter we subjoin its closing words, which are well worthy of attention:

'In the foregoing chapters, I have carefully abstained from making any appeal to the authority of New Testament Scriptures. The first and fundamental question is, not whether the modern theory agrees with our Christian religion and confession, but whether it agrees with sound sense and sober reason. If the theory is to be held as proved on these solid grounds, our views must be adjusted in regard to it. I cannot help adding, however, that if the postulates and methods of this kind of criticism are to be admitted, a good many other things besides our views of Old Testament history will require to be readjusted. The question may be put to a good many who seem disposed to accept the modern critical treatment of the Old Testament, whether they are prepared to allow the same processes to be applied to the New. I would seriously ask those Christians who regard Stade's 'Geschichte' as a successful exhibition of the religious history of Israel, to ponder the application of the same principles of criticism to the life of Jesus Christ in the second volume of that work. So far as I can see, the arguments used in the one field may be employed equally well in the other, and the Gospel history be critically reconstructed out of the tendencies and views of the second century, just as the account of the pre-prophetic religion given by the Hebrew writers is made the result of the projection backward of later ideas.

'Just because the issues in this controversy are so far-reaching, is it necessary to meet the critical view on its own ground, and to examine the foundation on which it rests. Questions are involved that lie much deeper than those of the verbal inspiration, or the socalled "inerrancy" of Scripture. It seems to me vain to talk of the inspiration and authority of books till we are sure that they are credible and honest compositions, giving us a firm historical basis on which to rest. My whole argument has been to show that, examined by the light which they themselves furnish, these books are trustworthy documents; that the compositions which are undoubted and accepted give their testimony to those that are questioned or rejected; that the books as they lie before us, so far as they can be tested by the only tests in our possession, and making all allowance for the ordinary conditions of human composition and transmission of books. give us a fair and credible account of what took place in the history and religious development of Israel. If that point is allowed to be in a fair way established, I leave the argument for inspiration and authority to take care of itself. The picture which the books present, if it is admitted to be in any sense an adequate representation of fact, will probably be sufficient to convince ordinary Christian people that in ancient Israel there was a divine control of events, a divine guidance of the best spirits of the nation,

XUM

law iere

Oct.

elletly een ere

retent inks e at igin ory.' netic

nies d by itted alled xiv.)

enant linate ed by of the noved ulated eriod. If that ations hip in othern ers to

it the it and inconant, at ern or ad lays was a d, and ything

a divine plan in the unfolding of the history, which we may sum up by saying there was a divinely guided development, or, as it has been expressed, that the history itself is inspired. How far such a description, in any specific sense, may be given of the history as it is represented by the theory I have been combating I leave its advocates to determine. I should think, however, that that is the very minimum of any theory of inspiration worthy of the name. I should think, moreover, that those who do regard the history of Israel as divinely guided and inspired in a sense altogether different from other ancient history, instead of underrating as a vague or negative result such a conclusion as it has been my endeavour to establish on the bare ground of historical criticism, ought to rejoice if, with even a degree of probability, it can be made out. M. Renan would, indeed, have us believe that the idea which animated ancient Israel, and was carried over into Christianity, is played out, having received its death-blow at the French Revolution, when certain thinkers came to the conclusion that there was no Providence controlling the events of man's world, no God who is to be the judge of man's actions. Instead of hailing with pleasure such an emancipation of the human spirit, we ought gladly to welcome any help that comes to the aid of faith in such a God as the patriarchs and prophets are represented as making known-a God whose revelation of Himself has been advancing with brighter radiance till it culminated in the manifestation of His Son Jesus Christ, who was the "light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of His people Israel." Such a faith as Old Testament prophets possessed has been the blessing and the guide of the best of mankind in their achievement of the best up till this hour; such a faith is more than ever needed just at the present moment, to save the human race from losing respect for itself, and to rekindle hope and aspiration for the future. The choice has to be made, in the last resort, between such a faith and "the divine pride of man in himself," which we are told is to be "the radical foundation of the new religion." And even the volatile Frenchman himself has said: "It is not impossible that, wearied with the repeated bankruptcies of Liberalism, the world may yet again become Jewish and Christian"' (pp. 488-491).

Our readers have now had placed before them an outline of a work which, as it appears to us, supplies a complete answer, by a competent hand, to the main contentions of the modern school of critics. We strongly advise any of our readers who are in difficulty on the subject to read it carefully. Professor Robertson has rightly, we believe, divined the true question at stake. It is not so much when and by whom the books of the Old Testament were written, though even on this point we believe that the theories at present in fashion will have to be very largely modified. It is the correctness of the account those books give us of God's preparation for the revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ. If difficulties are found in a volume

of su mean is no how on a confi ourse unqu nifica the in theor does thous vince the o and t devis fact

Resu

F

1892

IT is a happe died o death, that P preced forced four p heresy reign 1 contair be burn Coverd New ] importa of pers

Edward

tember VOL. Oct.

up

een

rip-

pre-

s to

num

ink,

nely

cient

ch a bare

gree

have

was

d its

ne to

ts of

ions.

man id of

ed as

adation ntiles ment

e best

such

hope n the an in

of the

said:

ies of

ian"

ne of

swer,

odern

s who

fessor

estion

books

point

ave to

count

ion of

olume

of such antiquity, containing a simple and artless, but by no means complete, account of the ancient history of Israel, it is no more than might have been expected. It is important, however, to know that if we reject the testimony of the books on account of these difficulties, we not only find ourselves confronted with other difficulties quite as serious, but we find ourselves entirely unable to give a rational explanation of unquestionable facts-facts which, moreover, have a vast significance for the human race. It is impossible to over-estimate the importance of such a conclusive refutation of some modern theories as is contained in the book before us, appearing as it does at a critical moment in the history of English religious thought in connexion with the Bible. It will, we are convinced, be ultimately felt to have established its thesis that the original foundation of Jewish institutions was 'from above,' and that the writings which record it contain no 'cunningly devised fable,' but give us an authentic account of the greatest fact in the world's history except the Birth, Death, and Resurrection of Christ.

## ART. II.—PREPARATIONS FOR THE FIRST PRAYER BOOK OF EDWARD VI.

Some Scarce Published Works of 1547-9.

IT is useless to discuss the question as to what would have happened if Henry VIII.'s life had been prolonged. He died on Friday, January 28, 1547, and at the time of his death, and for several preceding years, there can be no doubt that Protestantism was at a considerable discount. On the preceding August I Shaxton, Bishop of Salisbury, had been forced to recant his heresy of the Sacrament of the Altar, four persons having been burnt in Smithfield for the same heresy on July 16, and one of the latest proclamations of the reign had been that of July 7, when certain English books containing pernicious and detestable heresies were called in to be burned. Amongst them are specified the works of Wyclif, Coverdale, Turner, and Tracy, and especially the text of the New Testament of Tyndale's translation. The names are important, as, it will be seen presently, they are the names of persons who were in high favour in the first year of Edward VI. Another set of books had been burnt on September 26. And a similar recantation had been forced from

VOL. XXXV.-NO. LXIX.

189

eve

alth

the:

onl

cau

He

who

Bisl

of '

was

doc

tion

opii

of t

poin

subj

Lut

conf

for .

furt

the

abso

divo

Hea

mus

whe

the !

But

fatal

Luth

direc

and

to th

Mela

whic

1536

resen

sourc

lished

are p

reign

of E

likely

princ

subje

Dr. Crome on June 27. Neither had any noteworthy change been made in the services of the Church, excepting perhaps the Procession in English, which had been ordered by the king's Injunction to be sung in every parish church in England every Sunday and festival, and which had been sung for the first time on Sunday, October 18, 1545, being St. Luke's Day. The Act of the Six Articles had been in force ever since the year 1539, though its penalties had not been often enforced, and its most prominent results had perhaps been the resignations of Latimer and Shaxton in favour of their respective wives, and the restoration of Osiander's niece, Mrs. Thomas Cranmer, to her relatives in Germany. We need not, of course, remind our readers that the latter lady had not been presented at Court. Most will be aware that there were other reasons besides that implied in M. Merle d'Aubigné's pleasant apology for the omission, viz. that it was unnecessary, and would probably have embarrassed the pious German lady. No better idea of the working of the Six Articles, and the kind of Protestantism that at the time prevailed in this country, can be given than that which appears in 'The declaracion made at Poule's Crosse on the 4th sonday in Advent by Alexander Seyton & mayster Willyam Tolwyn, M.D.XLI.' It is a scarce tract, a copy of which exists at Lambeth (xxxi. 9. 3). The account of what Seton had preached is given at length by Foxe, who omits the recantation which was forced upon him. The tract consists of eight leaves only. In it he is made to confess that he no longer believes that men have no free-will, that things good and bad are to be attributed to a final destiny or predestination of God, or to absolute necessity, or that to assign merit to good works is to derogate from the all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ, &c. The whole protestation is drawn up in the most accurate language, and is to the same effect with that of Tolwyn, who also produced a 'bag or sachel' of books which he had had in his possession, and which he now denounced as heretical and blasphemous against the Sacrament of the Altar, free-will, good works, especially fasting, prayer, and alms-deeds, auricular confession, the marriage of priests, community of goods, &c. The principal authors mentioned are Frith, Zwingli, Melanchthon and Luther, and the Catechisms of Urbanus, Pacymontanus, and Sarcerius, and the Postils of Corvinus, and it is notable that many of these works were reprinted in the succeeding reign, in preparation for the coming changes.

The repudiation of Anne of Cleves and the execution of Cromwell had extinguished whatever chance Lutheranism had

XUM

Oct.

ange haps the rland r the Day. e the , and ons of , and er, to mind Court. esides y for bably dea of ntism than oule's eyton tract, he acth by n him. ade to e-will, lestiny that to fficient wn up ct with nel' of ne now rament prayer, priests, ntioned e Cateand the e works for the

ution of sm had

ever seemed to have of establishing itself in this country. For although Cranmer was himself probably at this time a Lutheran in belief, he was almost alone in this profession. The only other bishop of any ability who had espoused Luther's cause was Edward Foxe, who had succeeded to the see of Hereford upon Bonner's translation to London in 1535, and who had died in 1538, unless, indeed, Heath, at that time Bishop of Worcester, and afterwards in Mary's reign Archbishop of York, is also to be mentioned in this relation. But there was no attraction to the English mind in Luther's singular doctrine about the Eucharist. None of the persecutions mentioned in Foxe's Acts and Monuments allude to this subject, the opinions for which so many were condemned being almost all of them anticipations of Zwinglianism or Calvinism, the only point in which they agree with Lutheranism being on the subject of justification by faith alone. Moreover, the way for Lutheranism had been effectually barred in England by the controversy between the king and Luther which had earned for Henry the title of Defender of the Faith, and, as if still further to stop the way, the abortive attempts at union with the Lutheran princes of Germany intervened, as well as the absolute refusal of the Lutheran divines to countenance the divorce of Catharine of Aragon. And yet both Foxe and Heath, when they were sent ambassadors to Wittenberg, must have been willing to adopt the Augsburg Confession when they, in conjunction with the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse, signed the Thirteen Articles of 1535. But there were two causes, either of which would have been fatal to any attempt at the amalgamation of Anglicanism and Lutheranism. One was the fixed resolution of the king to direct everything in his own way, and to be supreme over all, and the other the bigoted adherence of the Lutheran party to their own formularies in the Augsburg Confession and Melanchthon's Apology. Nevertheless, the various documents which appeared in England as quasi-authoritative between 1536 and the conclusion of the reign no doubt bear a strong resemblance to Luther's and Melanchthon's works as their source and original. First there were the Ten Articles published in 1536, then the Thirteen Articles of 1538, from which are partially derived the Forty-two Articles of the succeeding reign, which were afterwards cut down to the Thirty-nine of Elizabeth's reign. But no communications were at all likely to be resumed between the king and the Protestant princes after the reception of Melanchthon's letter on the subject of the Six Articles, in which he inveighs so bitterly

against the bishops for having influenced the king against his own better judgment.

Such being the state of affairs as regards religion at the death of Henry VIII., it would have been next to impossible for anyone to foresee the violent reaction in the Zwinglian direction that ensued immediately upon the accession of Edward VI. Cranmer's tendencies were all towards Lutheranism, as is evidenced by the early publication under his auspices of a translation of Hermann's celebrated Consultatio, and the evident use that was made of the book in the compilation of the first Prayer Book of 1549. Cromwell, when he had wished to further the cause of Lutheranism, had ordered Taverner to translate the Augsburg Confession into English, and the work was published in 1536. But neither this nor a dozen other Lutheran works which had been translated during the following ten or eleven years had had any apparent effect on the current of religious thought in England. During the same time other treatises of the Zwinglian school had also been published, but seem to have had little effect beyond enforcing the denial of transubstantiation. Many married priests had gone into exile, and several English works which would not have been allowed in England were printed at Bâle and elsewhere, inveighing strongly against the doctrine of the Mass, and condemning bishops and the like. Especially had Bale, the scurrilous bishop of Ossory, and Turner, writing respectively under the feigned names of Stalbridge and Wraghton, composed works in most violent language against the doctrine of the Church. Neither does it appear that the number of other Lutheran publications which came from the press during the first two years of the reign had much influence over the religious thought of the nation. And there was really nothing by which an unconcerned spectator could judge as to the direction in which the spirit of Protestantism would develop, excepting from what might be inferred from the prevalence of Tyndale's New Testament. This Testament had been condemned in the last proclamation of the late king's reign, but had had a most extensive circulation through the country, and the marginal notes had been entirely against the Lutheran view of the Sacrament of the Altar, and were directed against the existing system of Church government, being of a decidedly Zwinglian and Calvinistic tone. It must have been mainly owing to the dispersion of these Testaments through the country that so many people, including Somerset himself, were imbued with these tenets. And it is remarkable how early a kind of Calvinism, long before the name of Calvin was known

in in and printing Go have the bili Call of imp

Epi

in t

of t

reig

Ma

189

que whi the from originare that teac the :

bega holy them the b when them

Most wort these absorbind S

from the co

his

the

sible

glian

n of ther-

his

tatio.

comwhen

had

ither

ransl any

land.

chool effect

Jany

vorks inted

trine

cially

riting

and ainst

it the

m the

uence

really

as to

ld dee pre-

it had

king's

the the

st the

rected

g of a

e been

gh the

f, were

arly a

known

in England, had infected English people. Even in the prologue and notes to the first imperfect edition of the translation, printed at Cologne in a 4to form in 1525, which was interrupted and stopped before it reached the end of St. Matthew's Gospel, there are unmistakeable evidences of the author's having adopted, not only the solifidian doctrines of Luther, but those of election and the perpetuity of faith and indefectibility of grace in the elect, which are generally associated with Calvin's name. Whilst in subsequent issues during the reign of Henry VIII. there are still more developed expressions, implying a disparagement of sacramental grace, a dislike of Episcopacy, and an attack upon the existing order of things in the Church, which long afterwards issued in the secession of the Puritans from the Established Church in Elizabeth's reign. These notes had, many of them, been repeated in Matthew's Bible of 1537, and in other translations subsequently published. And they are almost the only evidence by which anyone at the time would have been able to guess that the proceedings of Edward's Council would have been what from history we know they were.

The editions of Tyndale's Testaments, whether in their original state or in facsimile, are so scarce, and these notes are so little known to any except professed bibliographers, that we think it worth while to append a specimen of this teaching. Thus, in the prologue to the first edition we have

the following:

'In Christ God loved us his elect and chosen before the world began, and reserved us unto the knowledge of his Son and of his holy gospel. When Christ is thuswise preached . . . the hearts of them which are elect and chosen begin to wax soft, and to melt at the bounteous mercy of God and kindness shewed of Christ. For when the evangelion is preached the Spirit of God entereth into them which God hath ordained and appointed unto eternal life.'

Most of the notes of this edition are on the subject of the worthlessness of all works and the value of faith, but even in these few chapters we find a protest against the doctrine of absolution in Matt. xviii., where the note appended is 'Here all bind and loose.'

Some of the notes of later editions are as follows, extracted from the edition of 1534:

'Bishops and Elders is all one, and an officer chosen to govern the congregation in doctrine and living.

'He that hath such works may be sure that he is elect, and that he hath the true faith.

'The Holy Ghost oft cometh without any laying on of hands.

'God chooseth of his own goodness and mercy, calleth through the gospel, justifieth through faith, and glorifieth through good works.

'Grace and works are contrary things.

'Paul, though he came long after the Apostles, yet had he not his authority of Peter or of any that went before him. Neither brought he with him letters of recommendation or bulls of confirmation. But the confirmation of his apostleship was the word of God, conscience of men, and the power of the Spirit that testified with him by manifold gifts of grace.'

We have omitted the merely solifidian notes, which abound throughout, as no one denies that the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone prevailed through the Protestant world, and our object is to show how Somerset may have become imbued with Calvinistic notions, and how the way had been in some measure prepared for their acceptance. Tyndale's Testament was far the most influential of all the works that were prohibited by the proclamation of Henry VIII. And Tyndale's Testament from the very beginning of the reign of Edward down to the last year of that reign was most persistently printed and spread through the country by the Privy Council. There had been at least fifteen editions published between 1525 and 1538. No one had ventured to issue another for nine years. Yet in the first year of Edward they began to appear again, and the number of distinct issues bearing date from 1547 to 1553, the short space of six years, is no less than seventeen. This fact alone is sufficient to show what a violent reaction from the teaching of the Six Articles of 1539 had set in at the time of the accession of Edward; and that reaction was certainly not owing to the general spread of Protestant doctrine in the country, as is evidenced by the rebellions in different parts of the country, which arose upon the attempt to enforce the first Prayer Book of 1549. Nor, again, were the opinions of the majority of the members of Council such as to warrant the supposition that a movement in the direction of Zwinglianism would have set in. There is really no other account to be given of the gradual changes that culminated in the second Prayer Book of 1552, and the attempt to enforce the Forty-two Articles upon the clergy, than that Somerset was supreme, and exercised for a few years the same arbitrary sway that the late king had brought to bear upon Parliament when the Act of Six Articles was passed in the teeth of the faint opposition of Cranmer and a few other bishops. It was, however, necessary to proceed cautiously, for fear of offending the great bulk of the people, who were naturally attached to

the

1892

we not whi an a Bar desi

I no of o

than

And befo

begi or p

follo

that thro

ever

Thu 'Thi cong Afte were putti

But with wor rough good

e not either firma-God, h him

ound ine of estant have way tance. ll the

VIII. reign t per-Privy lished issue they

bear-, is no what f 1539 d that f Proellions

tempt re the as to cion of other ated in nforce

oitrary ament of the it was, ending hed to

merset

the Old Learning, and accordingly the changes introduced were gradual.

Amongst others there were, besides the New Testaments we have spoken of, several editions of the Bible with the notes which had been prohibited in the preceding reign, to which the same notes were appended with some additions and an alphabetical index, which summarizes them under the heads Baptism, Bishop, Free-will, Mass, Merit, Perseverance, Predestination, &c. Thus:

Mass. 'This word Mass is not in the Bible, . . . and therefore could I not tell what to note thereof, but to send the reader to the Supper of our Lord Jesus.'

Accordingly under this head we have the following:

Supper. 'The Supper of the lord is a holy memory and giving thanks for the death of Christ, for whosoever cometh thither unworthily, that is, without faith, damneth himself.'

And, again, under the head 'Sign' we have:

Sign. 'Christ hath left two signs for to show and protest our faith before his church, that is to say, the water of baptism and the bread and wine of his holy Supper.'

The idea of the Indefectibility of grace is illustrated by the following commentary on Matt. xxiv.:

'It is not possible that those whom God hath elected from the beginning of the world should be seduced so that they should hate or persecute the way of the Lord which they have once professed.'

The disparagement of the grace of baptism appears in every place where the sacrament is mentioned. We extract but one note on Mark i.:

'To baptize with the Holy Ghost is to work that thing inwardly that the baptism in water doth signify, that is to purge the soul through faith in Christ's blood.'

In many places the grace of ordination is entirely denied. Thus on Acts vi.:

'That is, admitting with an open sign them that were by the whole congregation chosen to any office to declare openly their calling. After this sort were hands laid on Paul and Barnabas when they were sent to preach . . . they received not the Holy Ghost by this putting on of hands.'

But perhaps the most remarkable feature is the persistency with which the editor seizes all the passages in which the words is and are are used for signify, to intimate that that is

also the meaning of Christ in saying 'This is my body,' in order to deny any real Presence and to assert the Zwinglian doctrine of the merely commemorative nature of the Eucharist.

The prime mover in all the deliberations of the Council was not Cranmer but Somerset, who, if he had any real religious belief at all, was a decided Calvinist, willing, however, to tolerate any form of religion which should allow of the destruction of the Chantries and the spoliation of Church property. Cranmer of Canterbury and Tunstall of Durham were the only two bishops who were of the Privy Council as ordered by the will of the late king, and any undue influence they might possess would soon be effectually put an end to, for the first of their acts as regards the Church was to compel all the bishops to take out a commission to exercise their office durante beneplacito. This was passed on Sunday, February 6, 1547, and was soon followed by the king's visitation, which suspended the power of all the bishops from the beginning of September till December, during which the images were pulled down at St. Paul's and throughout the country, 'and all churches new white-lymed with the commandments written on the walls. And at that time was the Bishop of London put into the Fleet and was there more than eight days, and after him was the Bishop of Winchester put there also.'1 This was in order to keep Gardiner from offering any opposition in Parliament to measures proposed. The next step was to get up a ridiculous charge against Wriothesley, the lord chancellor, who, as being a friend of Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, might be expected to offer a dangerous opposition to any measures taken in advancing Protestantism. After getting rid of the chancellor (March 6), who had strenuously opposed his being made Lord Protector, Somerset next procured letters patent under the great seal investing him with the whole authority of the Crown. Meanwhile, on the Monday in Easter week, April 11, Compline was said in the king's chapel in English, and those who were addicted to the New Learning, as it was called, began to show their faces, and the preachers at Paul's Cross had been appointed to preach against Church doctrines and practices. Amongst others Dr. Glasier preached against the observance of the fast of Lent. The next step was the publication of the Homilies, dated July 31, 1547, three of which were written by Cranmer and three by his chaplain Becon, at that time a somewhat advanced Zwinglian. After this followed the Injunctions for the destruction of images, shrines, painted glass, &c., in August. Parliament met in

1 Grey Friars' Chronicle, p. 54.

No adr to

189

mig was we pas Alt sha say

dat Sor to s tim

wha

be j

othe

foll

will set, tect

Who of usign take more pair hen on h with lord

"To

ly,' in

glian

arist. ouncil

real

howow of

hurch

rham ouncil

ue inut an

ras to

ercise

nday,

visita-

m the

ut the

com-

as the

than

er put fering

e next

esley,

oishop pposi-

ntism.

trenu-

t next

n with

onday

chapel

rning,

ners at

hurch

eached

ep was

ree of

aplain

After

mages,

met in

November, and among its first Acts was one to authorize the administration of the Sacrament of the Altar in both kinds, and to condemn all those who had blasphemously spoken against it, allowing such persons six months' grace during which they might do so with impunity. It seems scarcely doubtful that this was intended with the view of encouraging such speaking, for we learn from the Grey Friars' Chronicle that after the Act was passed there was much speaking against the Sacrament of the Altar, that some called it Jack of the box with divers other shameful names. This produced a proclamation against such sayings, and yet the chronicler says: 'both the preachers and others spake against it and so continued.' This Act was soon followed, in the spring of 1548, by the New Communion Office, dated March 8. And here it is impossible to doubt that Somerset composed the preface in which Edward was made to say that this was a first instalment, to be followed in due time by further changes.

'We would not have our subjects so much to mistake our judgment, so much to mistrust our zeal, as if we either could not discern what were to be done or would not do all things in good time. God be praised! we know both what by his word is meet to be redressed, and have an earnest mind by the advice of our most dear uncle and others of our privy Council with all diligence to set forth the same.'

The following letters, which have never appeared in print, will show how completely subservient Cranmer was to Somerset, and how completely master of the situation the Protector was:

Copy of a letter from the Council to the Archbishop of York forbidding certain ceremonies, February 20, 1548.

'After our right hearty commendations unto your good lordship, Whereas the King's majesty's pleasure with the advice and consent of us the lord Protector and the rest of the Council hath been here signified unto our very good lord the archbishop of Canterbury to take order in all places throughout all his province, that the ceremonies of giving ashes on Ash Wednesday (Feb. 15) bearing of palms on Palm Sunday and candles on Candlemas day shall from henceforth surcease and be no more used, we have thought good on his highness' behalf likewise to require you to take the like order within your province there accordingly. And thus we bid your good lordship heartily well to fare.

'From Somerset Place the 20th of February,
'Your lordships assured friends,
'E. Somerset, T. Cantuarien., J. Russell.

'To our very good lord the Archbishop of York, President of the King's Majesty's Council in the North, haste, post haste.' Copy of a letter from Somerset to the Archbishop of York, warning him that his proceedings were watched, and ordering the church plate to be delivered to the mint at York, March 15, 1548.

'After our right hearty commendations to your good lordship, these shall be to signify unto the same that we have received your letters containing among other things that it did be brought to your knowledge how report is made of you not to be so forward in things to be executed in matters of religion as were convenient. As we doubt not ye can on the one part consider our disposition not to credit or give ear lightly but when evident matter shall be ministered; so on the other part, because a number of eyes be to note the proceedings of those to whom care of things be committed; it is good advice for you to follow things appointed by authority in such sort and with such a readiness as may thoroughly answer, that is looked for at the hands of one of your vocation, and as there may be no advantage taken by men that be to note your doings whereof ye must think to be a number in the world.

'Touching the plate of the church both that specially noted in your letters and the other at the vestry, we give you thanks for remembrance of the same, and do think mete and by these ordain that all the said plate both the one and the other, saving convenient furniture by your discretion for the church, be delivered by indenture to the officers of the mint at York, to whom ye shall show this part of our letter for their better knowledge of it, signifying unto us what it extendeth unto with expedition.

'Thus fare your lordship right heartily well.

'From Woolsoks the 15th of March 1547[-8],
'Your lordships loving friend,
'E. SOMERSET.

<sup>6</sup>To our very good lord the Archbishop of York, president of the Council in the North, haste, post haste, with all possible diligence.

<sup>6</sup> Ex originali. <sup>7</sup>

The new Communion Order was the first authoritative change, which was soon followed by 'The Psalter or Boke of the Psalms, whereunto is added the Litany and certayne other devout prayers set forth with the King's most gracious lycence of July 1548' (Brit. Mus. C. 25 b). This is very outspoken considering its date, being far in advance of anything that appears of anti-sacramental teaching in the Prayer Book of 1549. It exhorts people 'to receive it as a memorial of his death, and not to eat it thinking or believing him to be there really.' It falls in with the omission of the word Mass in this Office, which word was restored in the Prayer Book of 1549, when it was seen that changes had been adopted too speedily.

The bee

1892

The it h it h equ Ref doc curi Lita Ron a co for i wer inde the sion of a tion

the sma the it is in the it that form

a co

spec

othe

oper could had

· A

is us

XUM

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  These letters are taken from the copies among the Tanner MSS. in the Bodleian.—Tanner, 90, art. 38, fol. 135.

ning plate

ship,

your

your

nings

s we

ot to

pro-

good

sort

oked

o ad-

must

ed in or rethat

nient

nture

part

what

ET.

ative

ke of

other

cence

oken

that

of his

there

1 this

1549,

edily.

ISS. in

The following sentence explains and apologizes for what had been done and what was yet to be done:

'Truly we have not in the Scriptures that the Apostles had any commandment to set forth the Mass or any such ceremony as hath been and as some are yet in the Church, for the Apostles had suffered before any ceremony was received into the Church, as witnesseth all ancient Chronicles.'

The Order of the Communion was the first instalment. it had gone a little too far, and after the reluctance to adopt it had been discovered, the term Mass was restored as an equivalent expression to the Holy Communion, although the Reformers were inveighing in the bitterest terms against the doctrine of the Mass and everything connected with it. This curious volume contains for the first time the prayer in the Litany for deliverance from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities. It is so scarce that a copy was sold in 1848 for 351. 14s. To prepare the way for further changes the small editions of Tyndale's Testament were kept in constant circulation with a new set of notes, not indeed with the avowed sanction but with the permission of the Council, till the year 1552, when another improved version, which may be called Jugge's Revision, with a new series of anti-sacramental notes, was issued with their direct sanction and *imprimatur*. Meanwhile the way was prepared by a continual issue of works, some by authors who had been specially condemned in the Proclamation of 1545, some by others who were specially employed for the purpose. One of the most important of these was a pamphlet of six sheets of a small 8vo size, entitled The Lamentacyon of a Christen against the Citye of London for some certaine greate vyces used therin. It is slightly altered from a previous edition published at 'Nurenbergh' in 1545. The book pretends to be a tirade against the citizens of London for still sticking by the Old Learning in spite of the Bible which the late king had had translated, but its chief intention was to defend the Act for the suppression of the Chantries and to vilify the 'Mass of that abominable whore of Rome which no doubt shall be reformed when the time is come that God hath appointed, as it is used already in divers cities of Germany.'

Such expressions as the following, of course, could not openly be sanctioned but were winked at by the Council, who could easily have forbidden or suppressed the book if they had been so minded:

'And if it be that God through the King hath cast out the devil

out of this realm and yet both he and we sup of the broth in which the devil was sodden, and that God hath not yet opened the eyes of the King to set all things in right frame and utterly to break down the serpent . . . take it thus, that even your iniquity with calling upon vain gods and seeking salvation by a wrong way is the very cause that God closeth up the eyes of the King as of one that heareth and understandeth not and seeth and perceiveth not.'

He continues that people might learn better from the Testaments that they had in their mother tongue, which would teach them to beware of false prophets like the bishops, for each Bishop of London in man's memory had been worse than his predecessor, and then exhorts them to pray that all foolish traditions and beggarly ceremonies may be abolished according to that sincere preaching of the Gospel which had existed in London for the last fourteen or sixteen years. The author proceeds to give his own view that the Sacrament of thanksgiving is a sign, a token, a spiritual memory of our spiritual deliverance, in which Jesus Christ is spiritually in and with us, just as He always is where two or three are gathered together, yet provides for the case of believers in the Real Presence, by saying that is no point of our damnation nor salvation, it only being damnable to worship it as God, thus plainly providing for the abolition of the doctrine of the Sacrifice, though allowing the liberty of believing or disbelieving of a Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar.

The pamphlet concludes with an invective against the Act of the Six Articles, specially as regards the part which enforces the celibacy of the clergy and auricular confession, both of which are treated in language which it would be hardly decent

to reprint.1

The idea of this pamphlet, that our Lord's words in the Institution are figurative, but that at the same time it was quite allowable to hold the old doctrine of the Mass, appeared in another publication which, perhaps, preceded this. It is entitled A Christen sentence and true judgement of the most honorable Sacrament of Christe's body and bloude, &c. This work opens with a similar declaration, that the Presence in the Sacrament is an open question about which both parties must bear with each other, after which the writer goes on to detail his own view of the figurative nature of our Lord's words, as when He calls Himself a vine or a door, and illustrates Hisdoctrine by the corresponding case of a bridegroom leaving his bride for a time and leaving with her a ring as a pledge of his unalterable fidelity.

<sup>1</sup> The copy is at Lambeth, xxx. 8. 14 (4).

tho but tion are

189:

never outvis m and thou you all,

bee

inst

only

&c., Lan the pare don aris not Gos trad be r to b out with wor in u in th as it

154

bish

to s

prin

not

Lad

take

vhich

es of down

alling

very

eareth

esta-

vould

s, for

vorse

at all

ished

n had

The

ent of

f our

lly in

e are

in the

nation

God,

of the

r dis-

ne Act

forces

oth of

lecent

in the

it was

peared

It is

e most

nce in

parties

on to

Lord's

d illus-

groom

ng as a

This

tar.

He also gives a preference to communion in both kinds, though not condemning those who receive under one kind, but he goes a further length in intimating that the consecration is of no consequence. The last words of the pamphlet are these—

'Though thou see that the priest drinketh wine unconsecrate, yet never stick at that, for as surely shall it certify thy conscience and outward senses, though he consecrate it not (so that thou know what is meant thereby) as though he made a thousand blessings over it; and look what we have spoken of the bread, even the same mayest thou verify on the wine. So that we need be no longer, but commit you to God, desiring him to open his light more abundantly unto us all, that we may walk therein praising him eternally. Amen.'

The writers of most of these little volumes seem to have been instructed, in putting out their views, to be careful to instil into their readers that the old beliefs were tenable if only they were not insisted on as matters of faith. This is the account to be given of A Compendyous treatyse of Sclaunder, &c., which has escaped notice, but of which there is a copy at Lambeth, xxx. 9. 4 (13). It specifies as occasions of slander, the worshipping of images and the purchasing of popish pardons, but on the other hand it causes slander if a work is done out of time, as the breaking traditions, where offence arises to men who are scared from Gospel liberty, 'who have not yet heard this manner of doctrine.' Still, 'whereas the Gospel is now clearly preached, the observation of unprofitable traditions is not greatly to be required.' People should rather be reconciled than provoked, and commotions ought not rashly to be excited. Moderation will teach men that 'traditions be outward things and indifferent and may be omitted and left Thus, though men are justified by faith, yet good without sin.' works are meritorious, and those who teach should use discretion in uttering both new things and old. This view appears again in the tract on Unwritten Verities, which is commonly ascribed, as it was by Strype, to Cranmer, and was printed in 1547 or 1548, and which, as it appears in the editions of the archbishop's Life, need not be quoted here. It is sufficient here to say that the purpose seems to be to show that kings and princes are bound to prohibit a belief in such things as are not written, yet might allow such belief to continue for a time, instancing the praying towards the east, the belief that our Lady was not born in sin, and that her body and soul were taken up into heaven. Nevertheless, it were well done that images should be prohibited. In this treatise it is further in-

<sup>1</sup> Bodleian, Tanner, 39 (5).

po

es

ma

th

wh

WO

ou

CO

ap

ve

Bo

dec

25

vei

the

boo

sin

Th

the

by

and

wh

SO

no

tion

visi

mei

hon

sacr

worl

mor is pl

culcated that General Councils ought to be gathered by kings as heads of the Church, but that their decisions were not to be received except they agreed with Scripture. The whole object of the pamphlet seems to be to prepare the way gently for getting rid of images and ceremonial, which, however, may be allowed to stand if sanctioned by royal authority, but not to allow the clergy to have any voice in the matter. In all these works that were issuing from the press, no special form of Protestantism was insisted on. It was only necessary that they should, in some form or other, attack Rome and the Old Learning, it being in all cautiously provided against intimidating weak brethren by insisting on their believing as the writer himself professes to believe. Cranmer was at this time a Lutheran, but was indifferent to special definition of doctrine, hoping to fuse the different schools of Protestants into one harmonious whole which might make an imposing front against Rome. He had already invited Peter Martyr and Bernardino Ochino, at that time a Zwinglian and a Calvinist respectively, to come to England to help in establishing a uniform system of doctrine. They had arrived before the end of the year 1547, and the Privy Council undertook the expenses of their journey and outfit, which amounted to 126l. 7s. 6d., and the same amount was promised for the charges of bringing their wives, who it seems were to follow them.

Another of these scarce volumes issued at the same time is called *The trew Judgement and declaration of a faithful Chrystyan uppon the sacrament of the body and bloud of Chryst.* In this the sacraments are spoken of as being mere signs, and the practice of Adoration of Christ in the elements is specially condemned. The author appears to think that there were many secret Gospellers who for fear of men, and against their conscience, worshipped according to the old form which was still established. It ends with the following aspiration:

'O merciful lord send thy holy spirit to dwell in the heart of our most noble king Edward VI., that he may purge the English Church from all abominations, to make good the words of the law of the Lord as did that noble king Josyas the Church of Juda and Israell, then should we no more sing the lord's song in a strange land as the psalmist saith, but we should then sing our psalms in the lord's absence all our days, worshipping Him in spirit and in truth.'

The next tract to be noticed is a translation of Two Epystles, one of Henry Bullynger... another of Johan Calvyne...

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Bodleian, 8vo, Z. 197, Art. R. S. (4).

d by
were
The
way
howhownority,
natter.
pecial
essary
e and
gainst
ing as

Oct.

at this ion of stants posing lartyr and a ablishbefore ertook uted to or the follow e time

e time aithful Chryst.

ns, and ecially e were t their ch was a cheart of

heart of English the law ida and strange s in the truth.' 1

ne ...

whether it be lawfull for a chrysten man to communicate or be partaker of the masse of the papysts, without offending God and his neighbour or not (R. Stoughton, 1548). This, of course, is decided in the negative, but there is nothing we need notice except the Preface, which contains the following passage:

'But then some will answer and say, We know that idolatry is a grievous sin and sore displeaseth God. But will you say that the holy masse and ceremonies that have been used in the Church this many hundred years and also set up by holy counsels be wicked, and that men commit idolatry by using of them? To that I answer that whatsoever law or ceremony the Church hath made or set up, and the same not expressed in the word of God, it ought not to be allowed, followed, or kept... Now where can it be found in the word of God the invention of the Papists masses or that images ought to be in churches or such like.' 1

The works of Richard Tracy had been amongst those condemned in the Proclamation of 1545, but now two of these appear with the date 1548, one of them with the date November 10, just preceding the publication of the First Prayer That of November 10 is entitled A brief and short declaration made whereby every Christen man may know what is a sacrament, &c., compiled by Richard Tracy. This is a very outspoken treatise, explaining that the sacraments are signs, differing from other signs in having a promise annexed; the effect of which is comfort, as receivers 'believe Christ's body and blood to be slain and shed for the remission of their sins. And thus they eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood. The clergy of England be herein to be reformed because they maintain errors contrary to these true principles taught by the primitive church and all the blessed fathers and ancient doctors.' It then proceeds to enumerate the abuses, which are that because the words are secret and in Latin, and so not heard or understood, 'therefore the clergy administer no sacrament to the people, for the words of Christ's Institution pronounced and declared in the administration of the visible substance causeth it to be a sacrament.' After enumerating other abuses, the conclusion is

'Therefore the clergy ought to be reformed by the king and his honourable council, that from henceforth they should not make any sacrifice for quick and dead of the sacrament, which sacrifice for the work's sake should deserve remission of sins, for there is nothing more contrary to the remission of sins freely given by grace, also it is plain contrary to Christ's first institution of the sacrament, which

<sup>1</sup> Bodleian, Tanner, 101 (2).

ordained it to be a memorial of Christ's only sacrifice wherein we receive remission of sins.'

After this follows a strong denunciation of the existing mode of celebrating, as follows:

'Thus it is come to pass that the use of the sacrament only serveth the covetous appetite, drunkenness, whoredom, and lusts of the wicked priests, and not one minister thereof administers it only as Christ instituted it, that is, for the spiritual comfort and for the confirmation of the faith of the receiver of the sacrament. Christ is not received which only by faith must be received through the hearing of His word declared. And because in the administration of the sacrament the clergy do not declare the words of Christ's Institution, which words be God's promise of remission of sins through Christ's body betrayed and his blood shed, the receivers of the sacrament receive it without faith, to their damnation, for faith cometh by hearing of God's word which they hear not declared, wherefore they cannot believe. Note well, Christian reader, whether our clergy be not most detestable sacramentaries which take away Christ's words of institution of the sacrament of his body and blood in the administration thereof, whereby the material substance of bread and wine should be made a sacrament to the receivers thereof.'

The other work of Tracy's consists only of four leaves, and is called A most godly instruction and very necessarie to be learned of all christen men and women before they come to the Communion of the bodie and bloud of our Saviour Christe Jesus. Compiled by Richard Tracie, Anno M.D.XLVIII. This is nothing more than a preface to a reprint of a work of Tyndale's. The chief point made is that sacraments in Scripture are signs which are called by the names of what they represent, circumcision being called God's covenant, though only the sign of it, &c. The work of Tyndale's to which it is a preface is A briefe declaration of the sacraments. Compiled by the godly learned man, Wyllyam Tyndall.

Thus far all the works we have noticed have given no particular indication of Calvinistic doctrine. They are all full of the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone, and the Zwinglian teaching as to the sacraments as distinguished from Luther's. The next book to be noticed is one by William Turner, chaplain and physician to the Protector Somerset. He had published amongst other books, which were all prohibited by the proclamation of the last reign, a translation of a work of Urbanus Regius, entitled A comparison between the olde learninge and the newe. This had been printed in 1537, and again in the following year, and was now reproduced in 1548 as a preparation for the coming

Bo mi

wa the jud un wo Le bra be to

As to full esp privato veigo of groothal form

clai

the

ing

of p

tion the port Calv

sight and lievir and them And tions have down choosinstill

VC

n we

Oct.

only sts of only or the rist is hearof the ution. hrist's ent reearing ot bemost nstituration uld be

s, and
to be
me to
Christe
This
work
ents in
what
enant,
de's to
ments.

full of and the ruished one by otector, which reign, a A commis had ear, and coming

Book of Common Prayer. The author is said to have been much addicted to the opinions of Luther, of which there is abundant evidence in his various works; but during his banishment, after the passing of the Act of the Six Articles, he was much thrown with the Swiss reformers, when he imbibed the sentiments of Zwingli and Œcolampadius, and, if we may judge from this treatise, had further advanced, probably under Somerset's influence, in Calvinistic views. In this work the Mass is spoken of as a sacrifice, whilst the Old Learning (so called) pronounces it to be a continual remembrance, and here a prayer is added that this ceremony may be restored. As regards the Episcopate, an objection is taken to there being any distinction between a priest and a bishop, because Christ said equally to all, 'Take the Holy Ghost.' As regards confession he does not absolutely object to it, but to penance being imposed, because the death of Christ is a full satisfaction. He then inveighs against the bishops, especially Vesey, bishop of Exeter, who was soon after deprived to make room for Coverdale. Canon law is objected to because Scripture is sufficient without it. Lastly, he inveighs against the forbidding flesh on Friday and the marriage of priests, and disparages the decrees of councils on the ground that no greater power is given to a general council than to two or three who are gathered together and who form a congregation, for which congregation there is yet claimed the authority to excommunicate its members. At the end of the treatise is Turner's own addition, recommending till things are settled 'in the mean season for the keeping of peace and charity . . . to keep the ceremonies and traditions of the church and the fathers whereas they hinder not the study of true holiness, or have no blame or fault.'

The author ends with a description of his own faith, a portion of which we transcribe as showing its connexion with

Calvinism:

'He chose us that we should be holy and without spot in his sight. And to them that he chose he instilled the grace of his spirit, and sent them the word of health which they received through believing it, and then came they to the feeling of the goodness of God, and of very love are ready to fulfil whatsoever God commandeth them, and look how much they believe, even so much they work. And though it be true that we be justified in Christ before the foundations of the world were laid, yet is that only known to God, and we have no feeling of it till faith come. And even as God cometh downward (for he through Christ had mercy on us, and of mercy did choose us before we were, and then after we come into this world instilleth grace through his spirit, and then sendeth us his word

VOL. XXXV.— NO. LXIX.

which the spirit causeth us to believe, and worketh faith in us, from whence all good works flow), even so do we go upward, and by my faith do know surely that God hath sent me his word and grace through his spirit to cause me to believe it, and therefore conclude that he hath chosen me and hath mercy unto me through Christ, his only Son, which is the image of the invisible God, first begotten before all creatures. Now is my duty again when I have and perceive this goodness of God, the father, and his son, Jesus Christ, to meward, that I stand not still and let his grace be vacant and idle in me, but according to the spirit that he hath poured in me and the grace that is given me, to use his gifts according to his will and commandment, to proceed from virtue to virtue as from step to step, alway approaching our loving father's kingdom nearer and nearer, where he sitteth and reigneth world without end. To the which bring us he that will all mankind to be saved. Amen.'

Turner had in the preceding year, before the abolition of the Act of the Six Articles, published another most scurrilous work called A new dialogue wherein is conteyned the Examination of the Masse and of that kind of Priesthod, whiche is ordayned to saye Masse; and to offer up for Remission of Synne, the Body and Bloude of Christ again. We need not say anything of this work, as its levity and blasphemy were fully exposed in an article headed 'Dr. William Turner' in the Academy for June 21, 1879.

There is, however, one of these small volumes which professedly deals with the changes introduced by the Council. It is entitled The olde faith of great Brittaygne and the new learninge of Inglande. Whereunto is added a simple instruction concernynge the kinges maiesties procedings in the communion. Compiled by R. U. Imprinted at London by Anthony Scoloker;

Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum.

The first part of this volume is occupied with a description of the introduction of Roman novelties and false doctrine by Augustine, 409 years after the true Gospel had been preached, which lasted from the year 185 A.D. to 544—probably meaning 594—and how the Britons objected to 'Austin's damnable ceremonies,' amongst which are enumerated the use of 'oil, cream, salt, and spittle in their christening, as we see at this day, which usage in those days the Britaynes would not receive.' He continues: 'I pray you is not the popish priesthood a dampnable sect, which say they can make their maker in their masses, and offer him up for a sacrifice which prevaileth [for] the quick and dead?' And the conclusion

'Therefore let the mass go again to Rome, with all Austin's trinkets, and cleave to the Lord's Supper, in the which is declared

stru probere in s

asse

189

ho

ren

Scriand king muc stirr maje man read the I Paul his sh

death

drink

this is

He to be He to bishop by the was go bishop and the Church year I font, to up of

leaves a beginning another

cular e

in the

by my grace nclude Christ, egotten ad percrist, to nd idle ne and will and to step, nearer,

which

Oct.

stion of scurrined the iesthod, Remisle need sphemy

ch pro-Council. the new struction munion. coloker;

descriplse docad been probably Austin's I the use s we see es would e popish ake their ce which ponclusion

l Austin's declared how that Christ offered his body for us and shed his blood for the remission of our sins, as hereafter shall be declared after the mind of the ancient doctors, which ye may perceive is conformable to the scriptures, whereas the adversaries have not the doctrine which is agreeable with the same, but fained fantasies and ancient customs which the apostles abhorred.'

The most important part of this work is the 'Simple Instruction,' the direct object of which is to justify the king's proceedings in the changes introduced. It must be remembered that this was issued whilst Lord Russell was engaged in suppressing the insurrection in Devonshire. The author asserts that the king and Council have only done as they are commanded by God's Word to do, and that the king had Scripture with him in pulling down the novelty of the Mass, and was bound therefore to reform matters, as other godly kings of the Israelites had done, and that the insurgents were much to blame, both for opposing his godly attempts and for stirring up both Scots and Frenchmen against the king's majesty. And it is implied that the Mass is still continued in many churches and the law disobeyed. He cautions his readers against Gardiner, Smythe, and Peryne, who maintain the Pope's doctrine, whereas

'Paul saith not as often as the priest lifteth the bread and wine above his shaven crown for the Papists to gaze at ye shall shew the Lord's death till he come, but he saith, As often as ye eat of this bread and drink of this cup ye shall shew the Lord's death till he come. And this is also the mind of the ancient catholic fathers, to receive it as a memorial of his death, and not to eat it thinking or believing him to be there really as he was borne of the Virgin Mary' (p. 27).

He then proceeds to the justification of the deposition of bishops, whose pomp and pride he strenuously inveighs against by the example of the Emperor Aurelian, to whom power was given to authorize the metropolitan and other faithful bishops to deprive Paul of Samosata, the Bishop of Antioch, and then enumerates the gradual abuses which crept into the Church, beginning with the institution of holy water in the year 109, Lent in 129, the hallowing of the altar and of the font, the 'anealing' of the sick, the requiem Mass, the setting up of images, the ordaining of celibacy of the clergy, auricular confession, and other ceremonies, 'which ye have not in the Testament any such doctrine set forth by Christ nor

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  A copy of this is in the Bodleian: Tanner, 809 (3) and (4). The leaves are marked  $a_1$  to  $a_0$ , the last being vacant, the 'Simple Instruction' beginning on  $a_7$  and ending on  $c_{1v}$ , the last page being vacant. There is another copy in the British Museum, C. 21 a.

none of his apostles; for the apostles were all dead almost twenty years before the first ceremony was invented.' The work concludes with a comparison of Constantine's having ordered fifty copies of the Scriptures to be transcribed with the number of New Testaments issued by the king and his Council, who could do more with 100% in printing than Constantine could with 3,000% in writing.

'Wherefore,' he concludes, 'let us daily pray to the Lord, the author of the canonical scriptures, that he will prosper the king's majesty, with my lord protector and his honorable council, in the setting forth of his word. So that through his help they may overcome the enemies of the same, his word, and of his grace's realms and dominions. Amen.'

There is another very remarkable publication of this year, which is dedicated by Edmund Guest, afterwards, in the reign of Elizabeth, Bishop of Salisbury, to Sir John 'Cheke,' schoolmaster to the king's majesty. It is dated 1548, and seems to have the same purpose as most of the other publications of the year—to condemn the doctrine of Sacrifice, in the place of which Communion is substituted. Its title is A Treatise againste the previe Masse, &c. Its language is more violent and outspoken than most of the other publications of The author speaks of the present time as being specially favourable to the furtherance of the Gospel truth, and so for the enterprise to 'disprove the insufferable abomination of the popish private privy mass,' which he speaks of as 'the present poison of our bodies and souls into death, not temporal alone, but eternal also.' He proceeds to argue that there is no sacrifice which is offering to God, but only a sacrament which is offering of God to men.

'Thus it appeareth plain Christ neither offered himself in his supper, nor commanded others to offer him in the same to his father. In respect whereof Paul spoke the selfsame words to the unpriested Corinthians which Christ reported to his disciples, and bad them also perform all those things which Christ demanded to be performed of his disciples, which thing he would never have done if the unpriested Corinthians might not [have] accomplished and put in execution all matters concerning the Lord's supper.'

He proceeds to argue that the consecration words cannot effect the change, because it was admitted that they would not if a layman uttered them, or if a priest did so without intention (p. 30). 'And verily the consecration hereof is the direct and open abuse against the right institution and usage of the sacraments of the said body and blood.' In continuation of this argument he says:

tha son this a c the fore In

180

str

ho

pres bod and

wor

reig

bee:

Suj

war
ing
the
Lov
was
date
John
certs
rall
of |
my=
beth

Cant Com titled sacri treat 3932 ton, and tical whice

custo and t The aving I with d his Con-

Oct.

rd, the king's in the y overrealms

s year, reign Cheke, 8, and publifice, in e is A s more ions of being truth, abomieaks of ith, not ue that only a

If in his to his s to the and bad to be perdone if and put in

y would without of is the ad usage ontinua'Well though the foresaid allegation of Paul were to be construed of our Christian priesthood and of our Christian priests; howbeit it ought so to be taken that it implieth no more one Christian than another, no more the spiritual than the layman, notwithstanding some be ecclesiastical ministers, which others be not, according to this saying of Peter, Ye be a kingly priesthood. But be it there be a certain allotted and chosen to a special sort of priesthood which the remnant of Christians be not allotted to; yet should the heretofore alleged scripture argue nothing for them,' &c.

In further explanation of his view of Christ's presence in the Supper he says:

'Christ, both God and man with his father and the Holy Ghost, is present at the baptism of faithful infants, where they become embodied and incorporate thereto, it is to wete, where they eat his body and drink his blood as really as we do at his supper.'

We have given only brief extracts from this important work, which represents opinions which subsequently in the reign of Elizabeth became widely spread. We should have been glad to have extracted more, for Guest became afterwards of considerable importance, though at the time of writing this treatise he does not appear to have come much to the front. The book is scarce, not being even mentioned by Lowndes. A copy is in the British Museum (696, a. 21). It was printed by Thomas Raynald, who also printed without date, but apparently about the same time, a doggerel poem by John Mardeley, entitled 'HERE IS A | shorte Resytal of certayne | holy Doctours whych pro | veth that the naturall | body of Christ is not | conteyned in the | Sacrament of | the Lordes | supper | but fyguratively | collected in my = | ter by Jhon | Mardeley | (...) | . A copy is at Lambeth, xxx. 9, 4 (11).

One other most remarkable work came out, printed at Canterbury, with the date 1548, between the New Order of Communion and the First Prayer Book of 1549. It is entitled 'Newes from | Rome concerning the blas | phemous sacrifice of the pa | pisticall Masse with dy | vers other treatises | very Godlye and | profitable' (British Museum, 3932 a). The writer, whose name is given as Randoll Hurleston, dedicates his work to Lord Thomas Hawarte. The first and chief treatise is in the form of a dialogue on 'the Papistical Mass no sacrifice.' This is preceded by a preface, from

which we extract the following:

'Howbeit, many of them now do repent and forsake their accustomed naughtiness and submit themselves unto the Scriptures and to the King's Injunctions grounded upon the Scripture, insomuch that they know the night from the day, of the which benefit a great sort had been partakers of at this present had not the devil withstood the godly proceedings of our young Josias. And although hitherto the religion have not gone so prosperously forward as some faithful would, yet it becometh not them that profess the true religion to cease at any time from exhorting other to ensue godliness and utterly to forsake their accustomed devilishness' (signat  $A_3$ ).

That there was considerable discontent at the usurped power of the Protector in ordering changes may be gathered from what the author afterwards says:

'But of these words let no man gather that I would the people which have received the light to make an insurrection, for I take God to witness I mean nothing less but that only the temporal fear should not withdraw any man from the living God. Then let the example of the heathen move us and make us more earnest in delating of our religion than we have been in times past (p. 33). And suffer it not now, if it be God's pleasure, as it is, to be trodden underfoot, but let us thank God for this we have received and desire him to increase in us the knowledge of his will that we may convert the stubborn and strengthen the weak. For this cause have I taken in hand to set forth in English this little book, wherein sundry matters whereby the people have been long seduced be well opened,' &c.

The dialogue is between Mithobius, who takes the side of the projected changes, and Polilogus, who faintly suggests keeping some of the old doctrine. The one asserts that we have no need of the masking sacrifice of the Mass, yet admits, at the suggestion of the other, that the sacrifice of thanksgiving may be admitted. Mithobius quotes Luther as his authority, who

'defendeth the dignity of the merciful sacrifice against these asses, and the sacrifice of thanksgiving is admitted only into the supper of the lord the which by us may be offered up to God... We that believe are become now a kingly priesthood, and it is meet that we offer incessantly unto the same the sacrifice of thankfulness for such a benefit... These things be taught every day in the pulpit, and you by yourselves may read enough concerning this matter in books which be abroad that I need not teach you.'

Polibius sums up as follows:

'Then this is the sum of those things that you have spoken of hitherto. This word sacrifice agreeth not to the supper of the lord, unless it be taken for the remembrance of the sacrifice once done, or for a thanksgiving.'

The second dialogue has for its object to enforce preaching as against ceremonial, though the Reformer admits that

do, La ren pre foll

nov

plac

Chi

189

501

tai

mo

we

wa

a (

tim

work he sent that seer ship tion

Lai

it.
Known The by I count

says

hath other perse searc king pluch devil hough s some eligion ss and

Oct.

power I from

people
I take
ral fear
let the
t in de. And
underire him
wert the
aken in
matters
&c.

side of aggests hat we admits, chanksas his

se asses, e supper ... We neet that lness for e pulpit, natter in

ooken of the lord, ce done,

preachnits that some ceremonies are allowable, 'after that we have once obtained fear, faith, and love.' We have no space to make any more extracts from this interesting little work-the other two dialogues being not immediately to our present point, and we have another publication, issued 1548, whilst Parliament was sitting, which we must briefly notice. Somerset, though a Calvinist himself, was quite indifferent as to sheltering his proceedings under Luther's or Calvin's wings. And so at this time there was published 'The Mynde | of the Godly and excellent ler | ned man M. Jhon Calvyne | what a faithfull man, whiche | is instructe in the worde of | God, ought to do, dwel | linge amongst the | Papistes | ' There is a copy at Lambeth, xxxi. 9, 3 (6). The work itself has nothing remarkable in it, consisting of a dissuasive of Christians being present at Mass. But the preface by the translator has the following important passage:

'Finally, seeing that Papistical abominations and idolatries be now well-nigh all known, tho' they be yet scarcely half left in many places, it is requisite and highly necessary to know how a faithful Christian man endued with the spirit of God and truly taught in his word shall behave himself among the Papists, wherein and how far he may be conversant with them, namely, whether he may be present at their mass and superstitious ceremonies without offence, in that he, although by outward gestures, as by capping and kneeling, seem to worship with them, doth, notwithstanding, in his heart worship the only living God, whether he may lawfully use such dissimulation or no' (p. 36).

Bound up in the same volume with this treatise in the Lambeth Library is another, which is dated December 17, 1548, and so is exactly contemporaneous with it. It is entitled 'A new Dia | loge called the En- | dightment agaynste | mother Masse | .' The contents of this work are so scurrilous and blasphemous that we dare not reproduce extracts from it. It will be sufficient to say that it is in dramatic form, Knowledge and Verity being the witnesses against the Mass. The actual state of things at the time of writing is described by Knowledge, who speaks of having travelled through the country preaching the true word of God, upon which he says:

'There hath been some that hath forsaken their abomination and hath received the verity of Christ; contrariwise there hath been other that hath been stiff-necked, withstanding the verity with persecution and murder . . . but now I thank my lord God the searcher of all secrets that it hath pleased him to inflame our noble king with his holy spirit, by the which he hath, contrary to their minds, plucked down the greatest part of their abominable idolatry, intend-

on

wł

Bu

pro

an

lar

ha

the

the

eni

refe

we

refe

cal

sca

the

reb

fore

sur

and

city

of a

stor

inst

usel

dan

can

mat

he ·

som

thou

have

wou

proc

auth

test

geth

he a

Ron

ing no less by God's grace to root it up all by the hard roots. Howbeit, brother Verity, I will shew you that there is one abomination that sitteth sore on man's concience that we must see a remedy for the Gospel's sake, which is the mother of all mischief and the abomination of desolation.'

This abomination is the Mass. Accordingly, she is condemned, imprisoned, and banished after being found in one of her abiding-places, which were principally 'Pouls, St. Faiths, St. Martins, or St. Pulckers.'

There are many other publications of a similar kind full of horrible blasphemy, some of them in miserable verse, which came out about the same time, of which, probably, but one or two copies have survived. But want of space prevents our noticing them at greater length.

The struggle that was going on in Parliament is illustrated by a letter written December 22, 1548, to Bellingham, lord deputy of Ireland, in which the writer says:

'All things go well forward in the Parliament house. They extinguish all Popish traditions. Goodly orders be already devised to stablish the king's majestie's realms in divine service to be used in his churches, but there is great sticking touching the blessed body and blood of Jesus Christ. Part of our bishops that have been most stiff in opinions of the reality of his body there now leaveth his body sitting on the right hand of his Father, as our common creed testifieth, but yet there is hard hold of some to the contrary' (p. 40).

There cannot be the least doubt, we think, in the mind of anyone who has read the State Papers of the reign and the printed books of which we have given just a small specimen, that there was a deliberate purpose from the first of introducing alterations even more extensive than those which appear in the Prayer Book of 1552, that Somerset was the prime mover in all the changes in ecclesiastical matters, and that Cranmer was a mere tool in his hands, drifting with the current, and obliged to submit to the advancing tide of Protestantism, beginning with Lutheranism, passing through Zwinglianism to a phase of Calvinism, his own real opinion being that it did not much matter to what form people inclined if only these opinions could be fused into one, so as to overthrow the Popish doctrine of the Mass. The Consensus Tigurinus, which was in fact the fusion of Zwinglianism with Calvinism, the latter throwing its mantle of piety over the naked rationalism of the former, did not take place till the autumn of 1549, and therefore could have had no effect

<sup>1</sup> Irish Calendar, p. 95.

Hownation ly for bomi-

Oct.

conone aiths,

d full which ne or s our

rated , lord

ey exsed to sed in body n most th his creed p. 40). nd of nd the cimen, introwhich as the s, and with

es, and g with cide of arough pinion ple in-, so as onsen-

ianism by over ace till by effect on the compilation of the First Prayer Book of the reign, whatever may have been its influence on the book of 1552. But it was absolutely necessary in carrying out his views to proceed with the utmost caution. The fact that people rose in rebellion in so many parts of the country in the summer and autumn of 1549 is evidence enough that the people at large were attached to the ancient forms to which they had been accustomed, and Somerset and his accomplices must have known perfectly well that the feeling prevailed all over the country, however much he might be able to count upon the adherence of such of the upper classes as were to be enriched with the spoils of the religious houses.

That the general feeling of the country was against the reformers has been disputed, and as it is an important element in proving the necessity of caution in inaugurating changes, we will give the facts of the case in brief. We need only just refer to the insurrection in Lincolnshire and that in Yorkshire called the Pilgrimage of Grace, in 1536, renewed on a smaller scale in the following year, which were speedily suppressed, there being at that time no chance of success for any organized rebellion against the king. But immediately after the enforcement of the First Prayer Book of 1549 there were insurrections in Devonshire and Cornwall, Essex, Kent, Suffolk, and Norfolk, and such was the danger apprehended in the city that in July the government was obliged to proclaim martial law in London, and the diaries of the period are full of accounts of executions for rebellion. Nor was quiet restored till the execution of the four leaders of the Devonshire insurrection had taught the people that further resistance was useless. Now the state of the country in general, and the danger there was of insurrection from the very first, which we can only gather from subsequent occurrences which are matters of history, was of course well known to Somerset, and he would take precautions accordingly. We have noticed some of the publications of the period which were allowed, though not specially authorized. There are others which we have not referred to, which went beyond what the Council would have at that time approved of, and there were many proceedings in advance of what it was expected would be authorized by the Council, which they were obliged to protest against.

It may perhaps be thought that Cranmer was not altogether of the same opinion with Somerset. Nor was he, but he avows that the doctrine he wanted to root out was the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation. And so long as

M

Si

e e

ou

pe

re

an

wi

So

Lu

bla

see

Li

of

the

In

'th

der

end

del

poo

ma

WO

kin

sist

of 1

fool

he :

Car

wer

the

prin

deci

colo

And

rece Dr.

bish

worl

that could be done he was not particular as to what was substituted in its place. His own words are: 'Hæ formæ dicendi, Christi corpus edere et sanguinem ejus bibere et panem corpus et vinum sanguinem ejus dicere figuratæ dicendi formulæ sunt;' 1 and again:

'When I say and repeat that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the sacrament, lest any man should think that I mean that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet he is corporally in the persons that duly receive them, I mean no such thing; but my meaning is that the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us, and of his blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacraments; but all this I understand of his spiritual presence, of the which he saith I will be with you until the world's end. Nor no more truly he is corporally or really present in the Lord's supper than he is in the due administration of baptism.' <sup>2</sup>

Thus it is no subject for wonder that Alasco, as well as Ochino and Martyr, should have been amongst the earliest reformers invited to England. Alasco arrived in September 1548. What we are concerned to show is that there was no sudden and abrupt change after the publication of the First Prayer Book, as if different parties and different interests had been concerned in the drawing up of the two Prayer Books, but that there was a scheme deliberately planned from the first, the idea being to get rid at all hazards of the service and the doctrine of the Mass and the sacrifice by representing the matter as one of reform and not of abolition. It cannot be denied that the successive changes in the Order of Communion in 1548, in the Prayer Book of 1549, and in that of 1552, remarkably fall in with this view, though they do not absolutely prove it. Peter Martyr's views may be seen in Gorham's Gleanings of the Reformation. Ochino's are not so well known, as his works are scarce, but he was a very pronounced Calvinist. Had Melanchthon responded to the invitation, and had Bucer survived, it is possible their influence would have made some difference, as Melanchthon had not yet materially swerved from Luther's views, and Bucer had always acted as mediator between different parties, trying to represent that the difference between those who believed and those who disbelieved in a Real Presence was immaterial, and a mere question of words.

Caution was of course especially necessary during the year 1547, for as yet Parliament had not met, and the Act of the Six Articles was not yet abrogated. During this year

<sup>1</sup> Cranmer, De Præsentiå, lib. ii. cap. 9, p. 55.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cranmer's Writings, &c. (Parker Society), vol. i. p. 3 (London, 1844).

was

rmæ

re et

cendi

them

that I

visible mean

virtue,

blood

them

of his

til the

ent in

sm.'2

ell as

arliest

ember

as no

First

ts had

ks, but

e first,

nd the

ng the

not be

Melanchthon's *Epistle to the King* was translated by J. C. (*i.e.* Sir John Cheke), the young king's tutor. It was described as 'enacted by the crafty means and procurement of certain of our prelates of the clergy.'

There are many more publications of the year 1548 which perhaps may be taken rather as indicating what were the real sentiments of the men of the New Learning of the period, and which go far beyond what the Council would have willingly appeared to approve of, but which probably Somerset was not unwilling to see spread through the country, and it is not easy to say whether those who favoured Luther or the Zwinglian party were most conspicuous in the blasphemies which they uttered. Seven of these may be seen bound up together in one volume in the Bodleian Library. One of them, entitled The Dysclosyng of the Canon of the Popish Masse, contains the translation of a sermon of the famous Clerke of worthy memorye, D. Martin Luther.' In the preface, written by its English editor, he speaks of 'the wicked mass, the upspring of Satan, the invention of the devil, the fair fruit of the Romish ravening Anti-Christ,' and ends his preface with this prayer: 'Have mercy upon us, and deliver us from the snares of Satan, and from the devilish pock of this detestable idolatry, and open the eyes of our magistrates that they may prosperously fortify thy blessed word as they have begun graciously, and to deface the bloody kingdom of Anti-Christ.' Luther's sermon which follows consists of a systematic analysis and comment upon the Canon of the Mass, in which he describes the priest as 'playing the fool thus with a piece of bread and a little wine.' Afterwards he says, 'I think verily that the very devil himself made this Canon; and again, Since the world was first created there

> 'Imprynted haue at al Papistes By me Hans hitprycke.'

were never greater blasphemies among all heathen than is in the Canon.' We need hardly say that this tract has no *Imprimatur*. It is in English type, and there is no means of

deciding where, when, or by whom it was printed from the

And here it will not be out of place to remark that in his recent volume, entitled *The Lutheran Movement in England*, Dr. Jacobs quotes (p. 48), apparently with approbation, Archbishop Laurence's commentary on the words of the title of this work as compared with the description of a work of Calvin's published in the following year (1549), where he is spoken of as

Comthat of do not seen in not so

ry prone invifluence and not cer had

colophon, which is-

ying to red and naterial,

ing the Act of is year

on, 1844).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Bodleian, Tanner, 47.

r

m Sã

W

SC

as

of

gi ha

of

pa

re

th

Sa

wl

ha

be

us

in

Le

on

un

the

po

in .

in

De

in .

in

nev

bac

of t

in a

eve

lati

is v

firs

'a man of right excellent learning, and of no less conversation, as showing how much greater was the influence of Luther than that of Calvin.' Like some of the other arguments of the learned Archbishop of Cashel in his celebrated Bampton Lectures (1804), this is a complete fallacy, the author seeming to forget that Luther is spoken of as recently deceased, and making no allowance for the difference of the ages of the two men, which was near twenty-five years.

Quite as virulent as anything in this sermon had been the expressions of certain Zwinglian books, which had been printed in English at Zurich in the period intervening between the passing of the Act of the Six Articles and the death of Henry VIII. Some of these began now to be imported, some to be reprinted in England. Two of these Zwinglian books had been published at Zurich in February and March 1543. One was a translation of The Rekening and Declaration of the faith and beleif of Huldrik Zwingly, Bischoppe of Züryk, presented to the emperor in 1530, the other a small tract with the title Our Savour Jesus Christe hath not overcharged his chirche with many ceremonies. The latter was imported; the other, being of more importance, was reprinted in London in 1548.

We need not give any account of Zwingli's Confession, as it may be read in Latin in any Sylloge Confessionum, but the four pages of preface by the translator are important, as showing how completely the writer identifies his faith with that of the Swiss Reformers, and how little he has in common with Lutheranism except the mere doctrine of justification by faith alone which was held by all the Reformers. The writer seems to speak in the name of the poor persecuted married priests, with their wives and children, chased out of England into sundry places of Germanye, crying unto God in their hard, desolate exile and grievous affliction,' who had been refused shelter at Antwerp. It has no reference to our present point, but it is not without its significance that in 1555 another English translation was made by Thomas Cottesford and printed at Geneva. The other work, evidently by the same author, explains the doctrine of the Zwinglians, or Sacramentaries, as they were scornfully designated by the Lutherans, and attempts to show that there was no special grace in the sacraments other than was gained by the reading and preaching of the Word of God. The author argues against the use of chalices, candlesticks, &c., on the ground that no

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The reprint is in the British Museum, C 37 b, and a copy was sold in 1870 at the sale of the Rev. T. Corser for 22l.

n the been g bel the e im-

, and

Oct.

these ruary eningly, o, the Thriste e, was

on, as ut the nt, as h with mmon ion by writer narried ngland r hard, point, nother d and e same Sacra-Lutherace in ng and against that no

was sold

mention is made of them in the original institution, the two sacraments being signs inferior in their efficacy to faith, by which we are justified, that same faith which Peter preached to Cornelius, 'without once so much as mentioning matins, evensong, censing, candles,' &c. One extract will suffice to explain the whole tone of the work:

'Wherefore, when the bread is brought unto us (which bread, called as it were in sign and token, or after the similitude and after the manner of speaking appropriated to sacraments, his body), a manifest token is given that the Lord offered himself all whole unto us that we might have our fruition and sight of him in faith. And thus our faith is exercised in that mystic action' (p. 70).

We have been obliged to confine our observations to a few of the more prominent publications which were to act as preparations for the coming changes. The new Prayer Book was ready very early in the year 1549, having been authorized by the 'Act for Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments,' passed in the second session of the Parliament, which began November 24, 1548. It was said in the Act to have been set forth by the aid of the Holy Ghost with one uniform agreement of the discreet and learned men who had been appointed to draw it up, and it was to come into general use on the following Whit Sunday, June 9. In many churches in London the book began to be used at the beginning of Lent, so that the book must have been in print before March 6, on which day Ash Wednesday fell. The assertion about the uniform agreement was scarcely worth much, as eight out of the eighteen bishops who were on the committee who composed the book voted against it in the House of Lords. in spite of all the precautions taken the country was at once in a blaze. The most formidable insurrection was that in Devonshire, and if this had been simultaneous with the risings in Kent and elsewhere the insurgents might have succeeded in overthrowing the government. The imposition of the new Service Book was the last ounce that broke the camel's The distress that had been caused by the depreciation of the currency and the enclosures of waste land broke forth in a rebellion which has been related by historians, who, however, have omitted to notice some important documents relating to its suppression. Cranmer's reply to the insurgents is well known, and the foolish inconsistency with which he first assigned their ignorance of Latin as a reason for altering the service of the Mass, and upon the Cornishmen replying

<sup>1</sup> Signat. C 4.

su

ha

me

be

to

tor

ma

kn

giv

is i

edi

der

pre

Th

his

con

rui

call

red

dan

sist

the

King

good

parts

beyo

mini to as

and

affair

charg

offer

God.

than

canno

whole on co

unbaj

under

nouri

Confi

sin, th

And s

that they understood no English, retorting on them that neither did they understand Latin. The King also was made to say in his Proclamation to them:

'As for the service in the English tongue it hath manifest reasons for it. And yet, perchance, it seemeth to you a new service, and indeed, is none other than the old, the self-same words in English which were in Latin, saving a few things taken out, so fond, that it had been a shame to have heard them in English, as all they can judge which list to report the truth. The difference is, we meant godly that you, our subjects, should understand in English, being our natural country tongue, that which was heretofore spoken in Latin, then, serving only for them which understood Latin and now, for all you that be born English. How can this with reason offend any reasonable man, that he shall understand what any other saith, and so consent with the speaker? If the service of the Church was good in Latin it remaineth good in English, for nothing is altered but to speak with knowledge that which was spoken with ignorance, and to let you understand what is said for you, to the intent you may further it with your own devotion.'1

This Proclamation is dated July 8, 1549, and was immediately answered by the insurgents in a loyal and temperate way, which historians have not condescended to take any Whether the remonstrance was ever printed we cannot say, but it was translated into French and published in the following year at Paris by a priest who signs his name Jehan Rivière. Somerset must have felt the danger of his position, as is evident from the many attempts he made to bring the insurgents to submit on reasonable terms before a blow was struck. There are three drafts of the answer to the rebels in the State Papers. One of them has been printed by Tytler dated July 8, but it is not nearly so full and explicit as that which is embodied in the Proclamation which bears the same date. A long remonstrance written by Nicolas Udall, taking somewhat similar ground to Cranmer's answer, was published in 1884 by the Camden Society. It is pacific in tone, but uses strong language against 'seditious papists and traitors, whelps of the Romish litter,' to whom it attributes the seduction of the people from their allegiance and their 'entanglement in the devil's snare by subtle and wily limbs of Anti-Christ.' Probably it was not set forth in print because of the difference of tone between it and the King's Proclamation, declaiming as it does against the Mass and auricular confession, and vindicating the law for the marriage of priests as being a safeguard for the chastity of their wives and daughters. The Proclamation had avoided controversy as

<sup>1</sup> John Foxe, Acts and Monuments, vol. v. p. 734.

that

nade

sons

d in-

hich been

hich

you,

untry

only

born

, that

the

t re-

with

with

im-

erate

any

d we

ished

name

f his

de to

ore a

o the

ed by

cit as

s the

Jdall,

, was

fic in

s and

es the

'en-

ibs of

cause

lama-

icular

priests

s and

sy as

much as possible. This reply enters largely into disputed subjects. The principal point made by the writer is that all has been done by consent both of Convocation and Parliament, and he reminds them that their best plan would have been, as they did not understand English, to petition the King to order the Prayer Book to be translated into the Cornish tongue. The reply of the insurgents to the King's Proclamation is a very remarkable document, and since as far as we know it only exists in the French translation, we will here give a short account of it. The only copy we have seen of it is in the Grenville Library, 11,906. The preface by the French editor praises the Catholics of England for rising against the demands made upon them in defence of their religion, and to prevent their king being drawn into error in his young age. The reply begins courteously with thanks to the king for his answer, which could not, they say, be his own, but was composed by those who had long abused his name for the ruin of the country and the oppression of the poor, who called them rebels, heretics, and schismatics, and having reduced them to slavery, try to force their souls on the way to damnation and then accuse them of treason for offering resistance. We follow their own words as nearly as possible in the following abridgment:

'We receive your Majesty's letter with respect as bearing the King's name but having nothing of your spirit in it. We and our goods are abandoned, and we reply as follows to the four principal parts of your letter. In the first place, our governors have gone beyond all bounds, performing duties reserved to bishops and other ministers of the Church. It was in the power of your sacred Majesty to assemble the bishops without intimidating them, like Constantine and good emperors did, and as your predecessors who referred such affairs as concerned the salvation of souls to the prelates who are charged to render an account of them. Permit then your people to offer the service of body to you, but to recognize the soul as due to God. We all of us will support your authority neither greater or less than that of your predecessors.

'As regards the second Article concerning five points of faith, we cannot see that such changes can be made without the consent of the whole of Christendom. For Baptism, which can only be administered on certain days, that may involve the loss of souls if children die unbaptized. For the Sacrament of the Body and Blood, we cannot understand that the Bread which you call Holy and blessed can nourish the soul unless it be miraculously the Body of Christ. For Confirmation, though it is not, as Baptism is, the remedy for original sin, there is no ground for changing things that have been ordained. And such things as have been altered contrary to the universal custom of Christendom by one who has neither authority nor power to manage

th

Wa

sie

a

me

So

mo

una

mis

Ap

sev

the

wer

dire

Rus

pro

exe

beh

peop

bein

Sun

tenc

priva

orde

pron

toget

one

to b

religi

made

in or

be ta

service

Augu

this v

destro

put t

prize

and th

to be

O

them deserve to be annulled and abolished as scandalous and curious. As regards the Statute of the Six Articles and its abolition, we desire that no laws be altered during your Majesty's nonage. And we are opposed to those who have endangered your honour and kingdom, for England is no longer feared and respected as formerly, as your Council and governors wish us to believe. We refer everything to your Majesty when come to ripe age. But your Council have plunged us into a war with Scotland which has impoverished the country. Are such fit governors? It is the duty of a king to be a father, and not to listen to those whom the people hate and who usurp too freely the authority and name of their master. We ask not for pardon, for we are on your side, and rebel only against your Councillors. We mean to hold out, for we consider it a grand opportunity to fight for the safety of your person, and to die, if need be, in defence of Christianity. Far better to die leaving to our children the glory of being descended from men who died to prevent the perversion of their sovereign and the destruction of their religion, than to live branded by all Christianity as heretics and schismatics, and to be in continual danger of death at the hand of those who desire to be the executioners of our souls as well as our bodies' (p. 76).

In further illustration of the position in which the Council found themselves owing to having gone too fast with their alterations, we may observe that there is an entry in the Council Book of August 13, prohibiting John Mardeley from publishing or setting forth in print any book or other work without first being licensed by Cecil. Now, John Mardeley had in the preceding year (1548) published two books, one of which is entitled A declaration of Godes Worde concerning the holy Supper of the Lord, confutynge all Lyers and fals Teachers whych mayntayne theyr maskynge Masse invented agaynst the Woorde of God and the Kynges Maiesties godly proceadynge. This had been specially dedicated to Edward, Duke of Somerset, and had been allowed free currency till now, when it was found advisable to make Mardeley the scapegoat, and to appear to differ from his views. That the man was not out of favour with the Council appears from his having in 1550 been employed by them to convey a certain amount of The other work, which was of similar treasure to York. import, is A Short Resytale, professing to show that Christ's body is only figuratively in the Sacrament.

What is most wonderful in the whole matter is that Warwick did not seize this opportunity for deposing Somerset from his place instead of waiting till the month of October following. He cared for neither form of religion; and his siding with the insurgents at this moment might have served his purpose well, as he would have been quite indifferent to the re-establishment of the old forms if only he could hold

ous.

esire

are

ıncil your

d us

Are

not

y the

or we

nean

r the

anity.

nded

n and Chris-

ger of

of our

uncil

their

1 the

from

work

deley

one of

ng the

achers

ist the

dynge.

omer-

it was

nd to

ot out

1 1550

int of

similar

hrist's

t War-

merset

ctober)

nd his

served

rent to

d hold

the reins of government in his own hands. Instead of doing so he himself commanded against the rebels in Norfolk, and was a party to the sending of Lord Russell against the Devonshire insurgents. We need not tell the story of the siege of Exeter and the utter discomfiture of the rebels, but a few extracts from the Camden Society volume, already mentioned, will throw some light upon the character of Somerset and his fellow-councillors. The letters, which are mostly in the Petyt Collection in the Inner Temple, seem unaccountably to have been left unnoticed by historians. miserably inadequate account of them appears in Riley's Appendix to the Second Report of the Historical Commission. A better and fuller account, however, is given in Macray's seventh and eighth Appendix to the Eleventh Report. From these letters it appears that Mr. Gregory and Mr. Reynolds were sent to preach and declare the Word of God under Russell's direction. General directions had also been issued to Russell, who was particularly directed 'to see his Majestys proceedings touching matters of religion well obeyed and executed accordingly to the order lately set forth in that In a letter of June 29 he is instructed to tell the people that they are mistaken as to the point of Baptism not being allowed in the Book of Common Prayer except on Sundays and holidays. They are referred to 'the last sentence of the first side of the leaf entreating of baptism,' where private baptism is permitted in cases of necessity.

After the insurrection had been put down, one Russell is ordered to dismiss his soldiers as speedily as possible, and to promise them their pay as soon as the money could be got together. On this day the Protector recommends Pomeroy, one of the ringleaders, to be spared, if he will exert himself to bring the rest to the knowledge of their duties and true religion. The Council also express the wish that inquiry be made for papists, Mass books, and the old superstitious service, in order that they may be burnt, and order that care should be taken by gentlemen and justices of peace to see that the service of the king's book be duly performed. Meanwhile, August 8, war had been declared by the French king, and on this very day Somerset gives private advice to Russell to destroy all Frenchmen's merchandise, ships, and goods, and to put them in safe custody, and to seize their ships and make

prize of any Frenchmen's wares.

On August 21 the Council ask for Pomeroy, Maunder, and the Mayor of Bodmin, and two or three of the ringleaders to be examined and dealt with accordingly, and order Russell

VOL. XXXV.-NO. LXIX.

CE

VE

W

of

ca

wh

the

mo

dat

opp

tion

fore

Ma

mer

by

tenc

mea

canr

offic

mitt

nece

1552

Adm

which

that

from

absta

Praye

curios

worth

to delay proclamation of pardons till they ascertain from them whether any more should be executed. The next day a letter of thanks is sent to the gentlemen and others of the counties who had aided against the rebels. One of the last of these letters is of September 10, signed by Cranmer, in which they complain of Russell for violating the law in presenting the houses and lands of the rebels to his followers instead of following the letter of a proclamation that had been made, that anyone who should first seize the goods and possessions of a rebel should be allowed to remain in possession of them. Russell had fancied that if he carried out the order it would have led to strife among the people. To this the Protector and the Archbishop reply that this was the express object of the Proclamation, for if this order had been executed, and one had taken possession of another's goods and chattels, it must of necessity have bred such variance, strife, and contention among themselves that there would have been less fear of a subsequent outbreak. And they reproach Russell for pretending to misunderstand that this was the meaning of the Proclamation, viz. to set such division among them as for desire of revenge or fear of loss the countrymen should rather have been occupied with their own affairs than be able to assemble together against the king. The next day Cranmer gave his sanction to the spoiling of the parish churches of their bells, partly to pay the king's expenses and partly on the pretext that the bells had been used to summon the people to unlawful riots. That this order was speedily carried into effect appears by a letter from Russell to the Mayor of Exeter, published in Cotton and Woollcombe's Gleanings, p. 192, where it is wrongly dated August instead of September 1549. As Paget had not yet been executed, the Protector addressed a private letter to Russell ordering his instant execution, as he had been credibly informed that people had begun to contrast his severity in consenting to his own brother's death and his leniency in sparing Paget. In another letter of the 25th Haynes, the Dean of Exeter, is requested to be in London at the Parliament touching the Common Prayer that 'ye make mention of,' and in the postscript we have the earliest intimation of the Protector's suspicion of danger to himself from Warwick's machinations, for he urges Russell to be present at the furthest about the 8th of the next month for matters of importance. This was the very day of the explosion which hurled Somerset down from his usurped position as protector and governor of the king. On October 6 he informs Russell more definitely of the impend-

XUM

hem

y a

the

last

mer,

w in

wers

been

and

osses-

it the

o this

s the

been

goods

riance,

would

ey re-

is was

ivision

ss the

eir own

e king.

iling of

ng's ex-

en used

der was

Russell

combe's

instead

uted, the

ring his

ned that

enting to

g Paget.

Exeter, is

hing the

the post-

tor's sus-

ations, for

the 8th of

s the very

from his

king. On

e impend-

ing plot. The postscript of the letter is as follows: 'They are not ashamed to send poste abrode to tell that we ar alredye commytted to the towre and that we wold delyver the busshopps of Wynchester and London out of prison and

bring in again tholde masse.'

It ought here to be mentioned that immediately after the suppression of the Devonshire insurrection, the Council on August 13, 1549, ordered that no more books should be published except such as should be licensed by Secretary Peter, Secretary Smyth, and Mr. Cicell. The last of the letters in the Petyt Collection is from Russell and Herbert to Somerset, and is dated October 11, 1549, but we are not concerned further with it here. Enough has been said to show that the attempt to establish the Prayer Book of 1549 was very nearly a failure, that the people of the country generally were in favour of the old forms, and to prove to little short of demonstration that the Prayer Book, for which such cautious preparations were made, and for the defence of which such elaborate and contradictory statements were made as suited the purpose, for the time being, of those who made them, was only a blind, intended to prepare the way for the more pronounced doctrine and declarations for 1552.

As we do not intend in this article to travel beyond the date of the First Prayer Book, we must reserve for a future opportunity all notices of the curious and interesting publications which have a later date than 1549. We need not, therefore, notice the new Ordinal of 1550, which came out before March 25, and is therefore dated 1549. Nor need we comment here on the words 'the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands,' and what was the meaning intended by those who drew up the Office. What their real meaning is, as intended by the Savoy Commissioners in 1661, cannot be doubted; for they inserted the words 'for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands.' But it is necessary to make one reference to the Act of Parliament of 1552, entitled 'An Act for the Uniformity of Service and Administration of Sacraments throughout the Realm.' which is cap. I of Edward VI., I and 2, states in its preamble that great numbers of people wilfully and damnably abstain from coming to church, but, ignoring the real meaning of this abstaining from public worship, goes on to enact a Second Prayer Book, because divers doubts had arisen, 'rather by the curiosity of the ministers and mistakers than of any other worthy cause,' the alterations having been made 'for the more

tl

n

u

vi

av

of

po

as

br

th co (P

fro

suc

of

the

end

uni

in i

Juc

a c

the

WOI

den

can

Mæ

plain and manifest explanation thereof,' and 'for the more perfection in some places where it is necessary to make the same prayers and fashion of service more earnest and fit to stir people to the true honouring of Almighty God.' Now we think no one comparing the two books could imagine that if the first Book was meant to be little else than a translation of the Old Service of the Mass, purged of certain supposed errors and superfluities-no one, we repeat, could imagine that the differences between the two books could be screwed to represent this view. We need only refer to the discontinuance of the Manual Acts in the Prayer, which was no longer intended to be a Consecration Prayer, but only a recital of the original Institution, in evidence of this; from which, as a natural sequel, there followed the alteration of the Catholic words, 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee,' into the Zwinglian form, 'Take and eat this in remembrance,' &c. If this was the direction doctrine was taking, we of the present day cannot be too thankful that the premature death of the king intercepted the further progress which was to be exhibited in the Third Prayer Book, which Cranmer had in hand, or that after the troublous times of Elizabeth Laud was raised up to be the instrument of restoring a more Catholic tone to the English Prayer Book, and to lay the foundation for that development of doctrine, of ritual, and of spiritual life which is witnessed in the Church of England in the last decade of the nineteenth century.

## ART. III.—GRAETZ'S HISTORY OF THE JEWS.

History of the Jews, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. By Professor H. GRAETZ. Specially revised for this English edition by the Author. Edited and in part translated by Bella Löwy. (London, vols. i. and ii., 1891; vols. iii.-v., 1892.)

WE are attempting what will certainly be a difficult and may prove to be an impossible task. To present to our readers within the limits of an article any adequate account of a work which in its English form fills five bulky octavo volumes, and in its German original occupies twice that space—an historical work, moreover, which commences with the migration of Abraham and continues to the anti-Semitic movements of the present day; which in its course touches the confines and

XUM

more e the fit to Now that nslasupcould ld be o the h was only a from on of Christ, e and n dochankd the Third er the

Oct.

EWS. Present sed for in part and ii.,

be the

nglish

pment

nessed

teenth

nd may readers a work nes, and istorical ation of nents of ines and intertwines with the religion, the history, the science, the art, the civilisation of every nation during all these centuries-is a labour from which we would willingly excuse ourselves. But it has been the chief purpose of this Review to furnish the Church with information and critical suggestions on all important questions of faith and knowledge, and the appearance in English of an edition of Professor Graetz's Geschichte der Juden, which has for many years past been received in some Jewish circles as the standard work on the subject, is an

event which we cannot rightly disregard.

As Dr. Graetz published his work in a somewhat unusual order-the first and second volumes, which cover the period to the death of Judas Maccabæus, not appearing until after the remainder-and as various volumes have appeared in more than one edition, it will be convenient to state that the copy of the German text which we have been accustomed to use, and to which reference is made in this article, is dated: vol. i. 1874; vol. ii. 1875; vol. iii., ed. 2, 1863; vol. iv., ed. 2, 1866; vols. v. and vi., ed. 2, 1871; vol. vii., ed. 2, 1873; vol. viii. 1864; vol. ix. 1866; vol. x. 1868; vol. xi. 1870. We are aware that since our own studies of the subject, later editions of some of these volumes have appeared, and that of the important eighth and ninth volumes a third edition was issued as late as 1890-91; but, as the whole work was 'specially revised for this English edition by the author,' and as it 'is brought down to 1870, whilst the original only goes as far as the memorable events of 1848,' and the last English volume contains 'a survey of the entire history of the Jewish nation' (Preface, p. vii), the present English translation must be taken to express the author's latest views. We learn, indeed, from a note prefixed to the fifth volume, which tells of the sudden death of the author on September 7, 1891, that 'one of the last literary labours of Professor Graetz consisted in the finishing touches which within a few days of his lamented end'—and in this lament Christian and Jewish scholars will unite—' he gave to this history.'

The author's preface further tells us that 'this translation, in five volumes, is not a mere excerpt of my 'Geschichte der Juden' (like my 'Volksthümliche Geschichte der Juden'), but a condensed reproduction of the entire eleven volumes. But the footnotes have been omitted, so as to render the present work less voluminous for the general reader. Historical students are usually acquainted with the German language, and can read the notes in the original.' He mentions, 'as the Mæcenas of this work, Mr. Frederick D. Mocatta, whose

n

V

15

th

d

CO

th

W

ha

T

no

in

Te

sh

pr

th

i.e.

ap

a j

an

the

un

Fio

bli

bu

pos

Bro

sho

fan

ing

wh

hav

clo

Cui

to :

eig

tug

(A.I

Per

whi

it d

Dr.

name is a household word in every Jewish circle,' and, as workers in East London and elsewhere would thankfully add, not in Jewish circles only. The editress of the English edition is simply designated as 'Bella Löwy,' and it is doubtless our own fault that the name does not convey to us full information as to the lady who bears it, for the patronymic is one that is held in honour in modern Judaism. We hope that we shall not be committing any error if we speak of this lady as Miss Löwy. She is said not only to have edited but to have 'in part translated' the work, and a note by her explains this to mean, not, as the reader of some passages might suppose, that the work of translation has been only partially done, but that she has personally translated 'the first volume, as far as the period of the Hasmonæans,' while 'the other volumes have for the greater part "been done into English by various hands," and have afterwards been revised and edited by me.' We confess that we think Miss Löwy has here chosen a singularly happy phrase to describe the translation as a whole, and we wish we had more cause to join with her in expressing 'cordial thanks . . . . to Mr. Israel Abrahams, whose scholarly co-operation has enabled me to cope with the difficulties presented by Hebrew and Jewish names and tech-We shall have occasion in the course of the present article to justify this criticism, which for every reason we would wish to have been able to express in other terms; but we must take the present opportunity of expressing our deep regret that the English edition omits the footnotes of the original, and contains hardly a single reference to any authority from beginning to end. There are few pages in the German volumes which do not justify at least some of the assertions in the text by an appeal to the evidence on which they are based, though it is in too many cases omitted, and perhaps for obvious reasons; but in these five thick English volumes we turn over page after page, we pass from chapter to chapter, from volume to volume, from title-page to index, and search in vain for any proof of statements some of which are sufficiently remarkable to require full evidence in their The English reader is apparently expected to take it for granted that every assertion has been fully established by the investigations of the learned original—an assumption which, we must confess, is by no means justified by our own examination of it. Nor is it the footnotes only which are omitted. The German volumes contain a series of extended notes or appendices, some of which furnish what is in our opinion the most valuable material of the work, and these

XUM

as

dd,

tion

our ma-

one

we

y as

ave

this

ose,

but

r as

mes

ious

me.'

en a

as a

er in

ams,

1 the

tech-

the

ason

rms;

our

es of

any

n the

f the

vhich

, and

iglish

apter

ndex,

which

their

take

lished

ption

r own

h are

ended

n our

these

notes occupy a considerable portion of each of the eleven volumes. No one of these appears in the English form, nor is any reference whatever made to them. The translation, then, if it fulfilled the idea of its preface-and it is far from doing this-would be only a mutilated torso, or rather would be to the original as a model would be to a building if it were constructed by chipping a piece of every stone and cementing them together, but leaving out any stones which the smaller

plan did not make it convenient to include.

But before entering upon any detailed discussion of the work it is due to both author and translators that we should have before us a more definite idea of its scope and plan. The first volume which Dr. Graetz published was that which now forms the fourth of the completed work. It appeared in 1853, and contains the period from the subjection of the Jewish kingdom to the completion of the Talmud—i.e., as we should say, A.D. 70 to 500. Three years later followed the present third volume, which embraced the earlier period from the death of Judas Maccabæus to the destruction of Jerusalem, i.e. B.C. 160 to A.D. 70. Meanwhile the volume which had already appeared attracted considerable attention, for it dealt with a period which was much less known than it has since become, and that in a large measure through Dr. Graetz's labours, and the third and subsequent volumes of the first edition appeared under the very advantageous influences of the Institut zur Förderung der israelitischen Literatur, which had been established by Dr. Philipssohn. To the fostering power of this business arrangement, and to Dr. Graetz's long-continued position in the Rabbinical Seminary and in the University of Breslau, as well as to its intrinsic merits, and perhaps we should add its polemical character, the large circulation and fame of the work is in no small degree indebted. The remaining volumes followed in due and, considering the periods which they covered and the amount of work which they must have involved, rapid succession. The fifth extends from the close of the Talmud to the spread of the Judæo-Spanish Culture (A.D. 500-1027); the sixth carries the history forward to the death of Maimonides in A.D. 1205, the seventh and eighth to the banishment of the Jews from Spain and Portugal, the ninth to the settlement of the Marranos in Holland (A.D. 1618), the tenth to the opening of the 'Mendelssohnian Period' (A.D. 1760), the eleventh to our own times (A.D. 1848), while the author's additions to the present translation bring it down to A.D. 1870. After the issue of the eleventh volume Dr. Graetz added the first and second volumes, which cover

the

eith

shr

Per be

to

con

und

Kri

Kri

whe

the

trai

his

Gei

'a

his

his

whi

not

occi

stra

ther

fron

hist

dest

task

spri

orig

his a

prep

clair

the o

half

then

mad

we

com

prim

of th

meth

On t

injus

respectively the period down to the death of Solomon (circ. 977 B.C.), and from that time to the death of Judas Maccabæus in B.C. 160; and the whole work thus completed forms the History of the Jews, from the Earliest Times to the Present

Dav.

The special characteristic of this work of so many volumes and of so many years of labour is, in the author's own opinion, that it is based upon a fresh investigation of original autho-The title-page of the English translation does not make this quite so emphatic, but the eleven-times asserted claim of the original volumes is that they are 'aus den Quellen neu bearbeitet.' The assertion meets us on every hand. We read the preface to the fifth volume, and find that the author has made no use of the then latest work on the subject by Jost,1 'weil ich mich nur an primäre Quellen halte; '2 or we turn to the first volume to seek the reason for the long delay of the earlier portions of the work, we find that the cause is in the difficulty of the interpretation of the 'Quellenschriften.' It is not now the poverty but the excessive mass of materials which previous workers had accumulated that makes the task so hard. There is not a point in Biblical literature which has not been treated a hundred times during these hundreds of years. Historical compendices, treatises full of detail, Biblical encyclopædias, handbooks of introduction and archæology abound; but all these, so far from placing the historian at the right point of view, only tend to lead him astray. He will, in any case, be on safer ground if he ignores this literary mass without form and void ('Tohu-Bohu'), and forms for himself an independent judgment, based only on the 'Quellenschriften.' He will need for this not only the endowment of historical tact and thorough familiarity with the Hebrew language and literature, but a third qualification, which up to the spring of 1872 the author could not claim for himself-a personal knowledge of the scenes of the history. The author is, indeed, conscious that he is not the only person who had visited Palestine with the object of obtaining light upon the Biblical narratives. There had been many tourists in late years, Englishmen, Americans, Frenchmen, and a few Germans. Many of these were, however, disqualified by their ignorance of the original languages, and had to depend upon translations which have their origin in the Septuagint and Vulgate, and are therefore entirely untrustworthy. Others, indeed, may have brought with them a knowledge of Hebrew, but

<sup>1</sup> Geschichte des Judenthums.

<sup>2 &#</sup>x27;Vorwort,' p. vi.

Oct.

(circ.

bæus s the resent umes nion, uthonot erted den every that n the ellen find on of t the had not a ted a orical edias, ut all int of se, be form inde-He ltact and pring rsonal ideed. risited iblical years, mans. rance transilgate,

ndeed.

w, but

vi.

they had brought also false historical prejudices, and they either did not understand or from ecclesiastical prepossession shrunk from making use of historical and textual criticism. Personal observation on the very scenes of the history is to be combined with power to use, and freedom and willingness to use, criticism of the sources of the history. We must combine 'Beobachtung des Schauplatzes der Geschichte und Kritik der Quellen.' The regulative principle is 'Die Kritik schärft das Auge, und die Autopsie regelt die Kritik.' Whether this principle is not really a vicious circle; whether the author's many years' devotion to tracking out the by-paths of Talmudical and Rabbinical lore had specially trained the eye for reading the simple original text; whether his position as chief teacher in what his former neighbour Geiger, the great Rabbi of Breslau and Frankfort, called 'a cram-shop for Rabbis,' was one which tended to keep his mind wholly free from ecclesiastical prejudice, or whether his earlier volumes are proof of such freedom, are questions which at once suggest themselves but which our limits will not allow us to discuss. Evidence upon them will incidentally occur in the course of what follows. It must have seemed a strange event to the Jews of Jerusalem to find a man among them, a Hebrew of Hebrews moreover, a teacher of Rabbis from the Seminary of Breslau, prepared to re-write the history of the Jews from the time of Abraham down to the destruction of Jerusalem, and with these qualifications for the task-historical tact, philological knowledge of Hebrew, a spring visit to the Holy Land, and free criticism of the original sources; and we are not surprised to be told that on his arrival at Jerusalem he was promptly excommunicated.

We are not concerned to question—indeed, we are fully prepared to admit—most of the qualifications which the author claims for himself, though we shall not be expected to concede the claim to somewhat exclusive possession of them which he half unconsciously puts forth or the claim to possession of them in an unequalled degree, which is quite consciously made by some of his pupils and admirers. But in order that we may fully understand what is demanded of us if we commit ourselves to our author's guidance, it will be of primary importance to ascertain what he means by criticism of the original sources, and what he conceives to be the right method of ascertaining and presenting the facts of history. On the first of these points we shall be doing Dr. Graetz no injustice if we say that he is in one sense a follower of Ewald,

1 'Vorwort,' p. x.

to

not

Ble

189

is t

the

onc

be

mo

Dr.

' ma

for

pro

lear

the

a cc

be t

'the

mus,

of p

conte

whic

If w

this

it ris

and

as w

leths

us, c

Prot

orac

of G

from

first 1

to ke

tion

discu

Sour

of th

F

though his standpoint, as we shall see, is really very different from that of Ewald. But let him speak for himself, and it will be convenient to quote from the English translation:

'But Judaism, together with its followers, had to remain an undecipherable hieroglyphic, a dark mystery which one century had transmitted to the other unsolved, so long as the "original rock from which it had been hewn, the depths from which it had been hollowed" continued to be unknown. Only a fundamental and indisputable knowledge of its primary sources and of its sacred origin could supply the key to this riddle. Centuries had elapsed and the solution was not yet found. Though Holy Writ as the mother of two or three religions had so long been deified by the masses that it was regarded as "the all in all," and its explanations of life and history had been eagerly accepted, it had fallen into contempt since the middle of the eighteenth century. It shared the fate of the Jewish race. The rationalistic school indeed paid a good deal of attention to Hebrew sources, but only with the intention of diminishing their value. Eichhorn, Gesenius, von Bohlen, de Wette, and Tuch were filled with antipathy to the Jews, and were thereby hindered from arriving at a correct understanding of the Old The clericals Tholuck and Hengstenberg only sought to deck themselves out with what they discovered, and they applied these discoveries to the uses of Christianity. In Jewish circles there were only three men who occupied themselves in a scientific manner with the exposition of the Scriptures, namely, Krochmal, Luzzatto and Sachs; but they timidly kept in the background, in order to avoid pressing too closely on the borders of Sinai. A man of childlike mind was the first to raise the veil for the profounder comprehension of the language of the prophets and Psalmists, and to reveal the ancient history of the Jewish people in its true light. With the appearance of 'The Prophets of the Old Testament' and the 'History of the People of Israel' (1843-1847) by Heinrich Ewald, a new path was opened up for the comprehension of the spirit and nature of the Hebrews. The riddle so long obscured approached its solution by the discovery of the key.'1

These words were first published in the closing pages of Dr. Graetz's eleventh volume (pp. 580–1) in 1870. They are repeated in English in 1892. There is no reference to any work later than that of Ewald. It is nothing to the author and editors of this professedly critical examination of the *Quellen-schriften* that the last forty years have been the most important period in the history of Old Testament criticism. The controversies which attracted English students in connexion with the works of Bishop Colenso or Professor Robertson Smith, the later discussions in which Professors Cheyne and Driver have taken leading parts, may be considered too insular, too recent

1 Op. cit. vol. v. pp. 742-3.

fferent and it n:

Oct.

ain an iry had al rock d been tal and sacred elapsed as the by the nations en into ared the paid a itention nlen, de nd were the Old sought applied es there manner Luzzatto order to of child-

t. With and the a Ewald, pirit and ached its bages of they are to any thor and

compre-

to reveal

thor and Quellenportant controwith the nith, the ver have o recent

to claim special mention in a work of this range which was not originally intended for English readers, but the works of Bleek, Popper, Graf, Nöldeke, Schrader, Reuss, are surely known at Breslau; and a voluminous work published in 1891-2, which, in so far as its earlier portions are concerned, is based upon a critical examination of the original sources of the Old Testament histories and prophecies, and does not once mention Kuenen or Wellhausen, Delitzsch or Stade must be considered as an anachronism. We do not think for a moment that their works would have in any way affected Dr. Graetz's judgments, any more than did the works of the 'man of childlike mind' who 'was the first to raise the veil for the profounder comprehension of the language of the prophets and Psalmists, and to reveal the ancient history of the Jewish people in its true light.' The patient criticism of a learned Jew upon the contents of Ewald's first volume, or upon the harvest of which they were the seed, would have been a contribution of real value; but it does not help us much to be told that

'the formulæ "Jehovismus, Elohismus, Deuteronismus oder Mosaïsmus, Prophetismus, Levitismus," with which the subjective criticism of protestant Theology is concerned, are mere Shibboleths, void of contest, as useless for the historic reconstruction as those Hypotheses which scent everywhere tendencies or interpolations.' <sup>1</sup>

If we were students in the Seminary at Breslau, and heard this as the peroration of a lecturer, we should doubtless think it right to accept and admire it; but breathing in the open air and looking at things all round, we must say honestly, much as we would prefer to speak in other terms, that the Shibboleths of modern Judaism, as expressed in the work before us, do not seem to be less void of contest than those of Protestant theology, and we shall have to present to the reader reasons for thinking that the subjectivities of the oracle of Breslau are at least as fallible as those of the oracle of Göttingen.

A student who has been accustomed to regard this subject from the high level to which the genius and learning of Ewald first raised it, and upon which his successors have endeavoured to keep it, will expect that, as a propædeutic to a reinvestigation of the *Quellenschriften*, he will find at least some discussion of the relation of Tradition to History, of the Sources of the Early History of the Authorship and Integrity of the Documents, of the relation of the Prophetical to the

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit. 'Vorwort,' p. xiii.

pre

au

fu

In

oth

wr

car

COI

fal

wit

exa

con

app

Th

wri

Sira

oth

Ad

The

as I

the

We

find

doe

the

his

Eco

afte

too

nan

the

pre

Jesi

not

plac

othe beer

that

acce

of t Wor 2te A

Historical writers. He may not unnaturally hope to find fresh light thrown by his Hebrew guide upon the Origin of the Hebrew Race, the Relation of their Early Traditions to that of other Asiatic races, the Relation to the Canaanites in blood and speech. From one who is a specialist in his knowledge of the Hebrew language and literature, he will look for fresh information on the Text of the Original Sources, the Masora, the Versions. But he will find in this English translation not one word of 'Introduction,' not a reference to an authority, not a note of explanation on any one of these or any cognate subject; but he is at once rushed in medias res by the sentence, 'It was on a spring day that some pastoral tribes passed across the Jordan . . . . If he turns to the original German he will find further that the 'spring day' was 'sunny.' A short 'Einleitung' is a panegyric on the Hebrew people, which is reproduced in the 'Retrospect' added to the fifth English volume, and in no sense helps us to an understanding of the 'Original Sources.' From the 'Vorwort,' of less than eight pages, we have made more than one quotation, but we must refer the reader to the key to the author's omission of any true criticism of the 'Quellen' in the opinion that it is a matter of little importance whether the 'sources' from which the facts flow, belong to an earlier or a later period.1

In the New Testament period Dr. Graetz is necessarily to a large extent dependent on the New Testament writings, but we do not find any attempt at a critical examination of any one of them. Thinking that the English must be here more than usually abbreviated, we turn to the German, where we can find only one accidental reference to the authorship or integrity of any portion of the New Testament, but that one is so significant that we must be allowed to direct attention to it for a moment. Dr. Graetz in a note on the records of the Resurrection informs his readers that, according to the author of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Jesus appeared first, not to the Magdalen, but to Peter,<sup>2</sup> and assures them that the passage or the epistle is certainly not Pauline. We are not concerned here to call attention to the perverted interpretation of the passage, but we think it our duty to

' Die Untersuchung ist daher beinahe gleichgültig, ob die Quellen, welche die Fakta überliefern, einer älteren oder jüngeren Zeit angehören (Ob. cit. vol. i. p. xi).

<sup>(</sup>Op. cit. vol. i. p. xi).

2 'Nach dem Verfasser des ersten Korintherbriefs (15, 5-8, sicherlich nicht echt paulinisch) erschien Jesus zuerst nicht der Magdalena, sondern Petrus, dann den Zwölfen, dann sämmtlichen Gläubigen (500), dann wieder Jakobus (allein) und endlich wieder allen Aposteln' (Op. cit. vol. iii. p. 248, note).

to find rigin of tions to nites in knowook for ces, the h transe to an e or any res by al tribes original sunny.' people, he fifth tanding ss than but we

ssion of

at it is a

n which

Oct.

sarily to writings, ation of be here n, where orship or hat one ttention cords of to the ppeared es them ne. We erverted duty to Quellen,

sicherlich a, sondern oo), dann ' (Op. cit. protest against the authoritative assertion of the non-Pauline authorship of it. If the writer's new investigations had furnished any proofs of this they should have been adduced. In their absence, and in the presence of the evidence on the other side, we must in charity conclude that this note was written in entire ignorance of the subject; but even charity cannot fail to weaken our confidence in a historian who compensates for weakness of evidence by strength of assertion.<sup>1</sup>

Nor are the 'sources' of the history of the period which falls between the Old and the New Testaments investigated with greater care. What deductions are to be drawn, for

example, from such a passage as the following?

'The Jews of Egypt, who had closed the temple of Onias at the command of Vespasian, and had thus lost their seat of learning, appear to have pursued their studies of the Halachas in Alexandria. They continued to occupy themselves with the translation of such writings as resembled the Holy Writ or the Apocryphal Literature. Sirach translated the sayings of his grandfather into Greek, and others translated the book of Susannah and the Letter of Baruch. Additions were also made to the Books of Esther and Daniel. These later additions to Hebrew poetry were considered by Christians as part of the Bible. In Judæa, however, no attention was paid to these foreign schools, but the Synhedrion of Jabne was regarded as the supreme authority' (vol. ii. p. 362).

We turn to the German original for authorities, but of course find none; indeed, the greater part of the passage itself does not exist in our copy. Are we, then, asked to believe on the simple assertion of the latest opinion of Dr. Graetz and his editors that the name of the translator of the book of Ecclesiasticus was Sirach, and that the translation was made after the fall of Jerusalem? We are not disposed to attach too much importance to the Jewish tradition, which gives his name as Joseph and his father's name as Usiel; nor yet to the Christian tradition, which finds a place in the spurious preface to the work and names him, like his grandfather, Jesus the son of Sirach. There may be reasons-but we do not think that they are generally known, for they find no place among the mass of information which Fritzsche and others have collected with laborious care, and if they have been recently discovered they should be given-for stating that the name was Sirach. Let that pass, however, and let

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> On the authorship of the epistle, Heinrich Holtzmann will be accepted as at least an unprejudiced authority. He speaks of it as one of the four 'paulinischen Homologumenen im modernen Sinne des Wortes,' which even the Tübingen criticism had not attacked (*Einleitung*, 2te Aufl., 1886, p. 230).

eye

sub

to

sca

his

op) He

sio

We

cor

nat

hin

hor

hav

of

sen

acc

the

the

wh

mo

Bas

he

in s

sub

key

sun

clea

of a

has

has

colo

tinc

clea

whe

thou

acce

care

surfa

mov

us more seriously ask what reasons there can be for assigning the date of this translation, in opposition to every authority ancient and modern, Jewish and Christian, with which we are acquainted, to a date later than A.D. 70. Nor is it in opposition to external authorities only, for the translator gives in his Prologue a definite date, and all the internal marks confirm it, and tells us that he came to Egypt èv τῷ ὀγδόφ καὶ τριακόστφ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλέως. This may mean that the translator 'in his thirty-eighth year came to Egypt during the reign of Euergetes;' but, with all reverence for the strongly-expressed opinion of Bishop Westcott,1 we are of opinion that it does mean the thirty-eighth year of the reign of Euergetes—i.e. of Ptolemæus VII. Physcor Euergetes II. This interpretation of the passage gives the latest date which can be assigned to the visit to Egypt, and that latest date is not A.D. 70, but B.C. 132; i.e. the date of this 'Source-writing,' which we are asked to accept as the result of the new investigations now presented to us, differs by about two centuries from the date assigned to the writing by the author himself and confirmed both by the whole tone of the contents and by the authority of earlier opinions. We have no reason to think that this weight of opinion will affect the balance in certain minds when it is set against the mere assertion of Dr. Graetz. We shall, therefore, venture to confirm it by an argument which they must, we imagine, admit to be conclusive. If the translation by the grandson is somewhat later than B.C. 132, it is natural to place the original work of the grandfather in, say, B.C. 190-170. Let us turn to Dr. Graetz's account of the grandfather. Again it is only assertion; but what does the assertion say? Actually that there was 'a poet and writer of proverbs, Jesus Sirach by name, the son of Eleazer (200-176)' (vol. i. p. 454). have no doubt that the followers of Dr. Graetz will be able to reconcile these statements or to accept both, but we must ask leave to be excused if we find ourselves unable to do so.

On the second point of our preliminary inquiry—that is, as to the author's view of the method of ascertaining and presenting the facts of history—we will also allow him to speak for himself. There is, perhaps, no better statement of his view of history than one contained in his criticism of the work of Basnage. It is incidental, and therefore the more real. After speaking in terms which are comparatively favourable he continues—

XUM

<sup>1</sup> Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. i. p. 479, footnote.

signing thority ich we s it in nslator nternal sypt èv σιλέως. th year vith all West--eighth hyscor ves the pt, and date of as the differs writing le tone s. We on will inst the venture magine, andson ace the o. Let Again it ctually Sirach .). We be able but we

Oct.

that is, ng and him to ment of the more ratively

'But Basnage was not sufficiently an artist to unroll before the eye in glowing colours, even if in images fleeting as the mist, the sublime or tragic scenes of Jewish history. Nor had he the talent to mass together or to marshal in groups and detachments the scattered facts consequent upon the peculiar course of this people's history. One can feel in Basnage's representation that he was oppressed and overpowered by the superabundance of details. Hence he jumbled together times and occurrences in motley confusion, divided the history into two unnatural halves, the East and the West, and described in conjunction events which have no actual connection. Of the deep inner springs of the life and deeds of the nation he had no comprehension. His Protestant creed hindered him in this; he saw the Jewish history only through the thick mist of Church history. He could not succeed in being impartial and honest despite all his efforts. "The Jews are rejected because they have rejected Jesus." In short, Basnage's 'History of the Religion of the Jews' has a thousand mistakes; there is hardly a single sentence in it which can be regarded as perfectly just and in accordance with the truth' (vol. v. pp. 208-209).

We fear that a candid judgment would apply most of these terms *mutatis mutandis* to the work before us, and there could be, perhaps, no truer criticism of it than that which the author unconsciously supplies; but we wish at this moment to direct attention only to Dr. Graetz's opinion that Basnage failed because he was not, and the implication that he himself is, 'sufficiently an artist to unroll before the eye in glowing colours, even if in images fleeting as the mist, the sublime or tragic scenes of Jewish history.' If we take this key to the work with us, the opening words, 'It was on a sunny spring day . .' and all that follows become at once clear. It will be interesting to place by the side of this view of a History of Israel another which Mr. Russell Martineau has based upon the great work of Ewald to which reference has been already made (p. 74).

'The value of a history does not depend on the vividness of its colours, or in other words the positiveness of its assertions. It is natural to prefer a clear picture to a misty; and the craving for distinctness has led former story-tellers to make their colours bright and clear, and to eschew the question (if it ever arises in their minds), whether the subject-matter is really as clear as they make it. Such thoughtlessly and artlessly composed stories, which were formerly accepted as real history, it is the duty of the earnest and critical (i.e. carefully judging) historian to sift and analyse, separating the gaudy surface-colouring from the plain reality which lies beneath, and removing utterly any surface-colouring which covers nothing at all.'

<sup>1</sup> Ewald, History of Israel, Eng. Trans., vol. i. Preface, pp. viii and ix.

full

bet

giv

dec

det

Mú Pal

Wi

not

187

bas

the

Gra

now

wer

ther ject,

'the

peni

the .

peak

[sic],

And

whic

but

cursi

It will be evident without further comment which view of History commends itself to our judgment, and we must not be diverted from our special purpose of estimating the work of Dr. Graetz. In doing this it will be necessary to confine our attention at first to the Biblical period. We have to think of our author then as devoting a spring-season to the topography of the Holy Land, with the Biblical records in their simple text as his only further guide, with a critical spirit quite ready to neglect or resettle the authorship or to amend the text when it seems necessary without real authority for doing so, and with an artistic purpose which will and power which can 'unroll before the eye in glowing colours, even if in images fleeting as the mist, the sublime or tragic scenes of Jewish

history.' Let us look at some of the results.

In three instances in the first English volume attention is called in brief foot notes to corrections of matters of fact or of the text. If we examine all we shall be free from any danger of unfairness in selection. One of them relates to the situation of Sinai. There has been, as is well known, much difference of opinion upon this point, and the result is that it has been the subject of the most minute examination. The traditional site is the Jebel Músa. Burckhardt, Lipsius, and others showed cause in favour of the Jebel Serbál, which is also supported by the Egyptologist Ebers, and for which tradition is also pleaded. The high authority of Robinson was given to the Rás-as-Sufsáfeh, and this was generally accepted until Laborde revived the old tradition Jebel Músa, and he has been followed by independent investigators, such as Krafft, Graub, Strauss, and Ritter, 'with his usual union of diffidence and learning.' Now in this investigation English scholars and travellers have taken a very considerable part. Most of our readers will remember the charming account by one of our English historians of Israel of his own visit to the peninsula, of his somewhat hesitating preference of Jebel Músa to Mount Serbal, but unhesitating certainty that 'between these two clusters the question must lie.' 1

Still later the services of scientific experts and scholars have been combined under the direction of the 'Sinai Survey Expedition,' the 'Palestine Exploration Fund,' and the 'Ordnance Survey.' Professor Hull, in his account of the scientific expedition which he directed, reports as follows in

1885 :-

'The claims of the different mountains of the Sinaitic peninsula to be that from which the Law was delivered to Israel have been carefor i Grae conte The Judge Chus

their king more 'Meso is Aras 'S as 'S

fuller nahar Chush

VOL

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, p. 39.

ew of

not be

ork of

ne our

of our

phy of

e text

ady to

when

so, and

ch can

images

Jewish

ation is

fact or

om any s to the i, much

that it

ius, and

vhich is r which

obinson

enerally

el Musa,

ors, such

union of

English

ole part.

ount by

sit to the

of Jebel

that 'be-

scholars

ai Survey

and the

nt of the

ollows in

eninsula to

been care-

The

fully analysed by one who knows the topographical details, perhaps, better than any other Englishman, Colonel Sir Charles Wilson, who gives his decision in favour of Jebel Músa, or Moses' Mount—a decision which must be accepted as final. It has been shown in detail by this author, that all the requirements of the case as described in the Bible are met in their minutest details, if we accept Jebel Músa as the "Mount of the Law." In this view the late Professor Palmer concurred.' With the work of the 'Sinai Survey Expedition' Dr. Graetz was

With the work of the 'Sinai Survey Expedition' Dr. Graetz was not unacquainted when he published his first German volume in 1874. The interesting note 4, pp. 390–399, is, indeed, largely based upon Professor Palmer's Desert of the Exodus, which had then attracted the attention of European experts, though Dr. Graetz's account of it is marred by strange inaccuracies. But now the English reader is told authoritatively, as though there were really no question to be asked, and without a hint that there is any English work which he can consult on the subject, that

'the situation of Sinai is not to be sought in the so-called Sinaitic peninsula, but near the land of Edom, on the confines of which was the desert of Paran. Neither Jebel Musa [sic], with the adjacent peaks of Jebel Catherine and Ras-es-Sufsafeh [sic], nor Mount Jerbal [sic], was the true Sinai' (vol. i. p. 21, note).

And if, in blank astonishment at this extraordinary statement, which is opposed not only to a consensus of former opinion, but to that of Dr. Graetz himself as expressed in the excursus to which we have referred, he asks for some reasons for it, he is simply told, 'See "Monatschrift," by Fränkel-Graetz, 1878, p. 337.' The oracle has spoken. He must be The second instance is a question of the text. The English version, following the Masoretic text, tells us in Judges iii. 8-10 that the Lord sold Israel 'into the hand of Chushan-Rishathaim king of Mesopotamia,' and that upon their crying unto Him He 'delivered Chushan-Rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia,' into the hand of Othniel. The margin, moreover, tells us that in verse 8 the Hebrew words rendered 'Mesopotamia' are Aram-naharaim, and that in verse 10 it is Aram only—i.e. when first mentioned it is described in full as 'Syria of the two rivers,' and then in the immediate context as 'Syria' only, there being no further need of adding the fuller topographical definition. We are familiar with Aramnaharaim from Gen. xxiv. 10 and Deut. xxiii. 4, but of Chushan-Rishathaim we know nothing. This special ignor-

VOL. XXXV.—NO. LXIX.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ordnance Survey of Sinai, p. 140. <sup>2</sup> Hull, Mount Seir, &c., pp. 186 sq.

d

th

h

m

pi

to

ou

ha

he

of

the

pla

tha

En

froi

see

arti

us t

'the

refe

that

Büch

ance has not, however, seemed surprising in the midst of our general ignorance of the political condition of Mesopotamia at this time. As far as we have any hints, they go to make this incident probable enough. Kings of Shirar and Elam appear in the south of Palestine even in Abraham's time, and the names of the kings of Edom preserved in Gen. xxxvi. make it at least not unlikely that an Aramæan dynasty held the sway of Edom in the time of Othniel. Cf. Gen. x. 8-11 and Habak. iii. 7. But Dr. Graetz tells us of Othniel that 'having collected a brave band of combatants, he advanced against an Idumæan king, and delivered the southern tribes of Judah and Simeon' (vol. i. p. 62), and then adds in a provokingly short and assertive note, 'Judges iii. 8 and 10 must be read "king of Edom" (ארום) instead of Aram (ארם).' If the reader of this note turns for further information to the German he will find (note 7, pp. 407-415) a longer explanation, which, however, does not prove much more than that ארם and אדום may be from similarity of letters interchanged, and that in some few passages more or less evidence of such interchange is furnished by the Masora, the LXX, and the Syriac. This no one will doubt; but if the witnesses for change in some other places are silent in this, the deduction which we ought to draw would seem to be not quite that which Dr. Graetz does draw. Why are we not told, either in German or in English, that the Masora has no hint of a variation, that the LXX has in both verses \(\Sigma\nu\) \(\text{volas}\) \(\pi\)\(\text{ora}\nu\)\(\overline{\pi}\)\(\text{v}\), that the Vulgate has 'Mesopotamiæ' in one verse and 'Syriæ' in the other, that the Targum reads 'Chushan the wicked, king of Syria on Euphrates,' and that the Syriac and Arabic have similar renderings? Moreover, when Aram is changed into Edom, Naharaim has still to be got rid of and Rishathaim has to be explained. The latter word Dr. Graetz passes over; the former he hesitatingly resolves into the Horim (!) of Deut. ii. 12. We do not wish to discuss the questions here raised. We make no claim to the necessary qualifications which Dr. Graetz possessed. Possibly he may be right, but we think that the evidence is wholly against him. We must, however, express our conviction that the note on which we are commenting is wholly unjustifiable. In a work of such dimensions and such parade of learning the English reader has a right to expect absolutely safe guidance. It is not safe guidance to tell him without any reference to the facts of the case that ' must be read instead of ארם.' We fear that we may cause offence to some of the followers of Dr. Graetz by mentioning on the same page with his voluminous work such a very small and

XUM

Oct. of our tamia make Elam ie, and xxxvi. ty held c. 8-11 el that lvanced tribes a pro-10 must nk).' If to the xplanathat ארם ged, and ch inter-Syriac. in some ve ought r. Graetz an or in that the · Vulgate ther, that ia on Euar renderm, Nahato be exthe former ut. ii. 12. ised. We Dr. Graetz k that the er, express menting is s and such t to expect to tell him

שרו must be use offence

ning on the

small and

unpretending book as the Cambridge Bible for Schools, but the reader who wishes information on this subject will find more in the short notes on Judges iii. 8–10 in the volume of this series than in the whole of the English or German work before us.

The third instance in which it is thought necessary to call special attention to the text by an explanatory footnote is on p. 95. Our English Bible represents Agag as saying, before his destruction by Samuel, 'Surely the bitterness of death is past,' and this is a correct translation of the Masoretic text, אכן סר מרדהמות. Dr. Graetz tells us that 'the Amalekite king exclaimed in his fear, "Oh, how bitter, how bitter is death!"' and adds in a note, 'In the 32nd verse read mar mar hamaveth' (sic). The question is not worth further discussion in this place, as it only illustrates a method of treatment similar to that of the instances which we have just noticed. It really depends upon the earlier and more difficult clause of the verse. We venture to believe that the reading adopted by Dr. Graetz in part after the LXX and Syriac is wrong; but, even if it is right, nothing can justify the positive and unscholarly assertion of the note which we have just quoted. A Biblical critic of Dr. Graetz's eminence must have known that the year before this translation was published, by far the most important contribution ever made to the textual criticism of the Books of Samuel appeared in this country from the pen of Dr. Driver. The English reader ought not to be simply told that he is to 'read mar mar hamaveth' (sic). If he had been referred to Dr. Driver's work he would have found a competent note on the real difficulty of the verse, and would have been told that the reading of the LXX and Pesh., 'Surely death is bitter,' is a mere platitude.

These instances will suffice as examples—and let us repeat that they are chosen for us and not by us—of the gain to the English reader from the author's special qualifications derived from linguistic and topographical knowledge. We must further see what we owe to the results of his special historic tact and artistic power. Examples occur on almost every page. Let us take the following account, which is based upon that of 'the contemporary prophet Amos.' The German gives the references which are omitted in the English. We know, then, that the original materials from which the following picture

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cf. Driver and Thenius, ad loc., and Wellhausen, Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, p. 101.

is worked up are Amos ii. 11, 12, and v. 10. Let us look at them:—

'And I raised up of your sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites. Is it not even thus, O ye children of Israel? saith the Lord. But ye gave the Nazarites wine to drink; and commanded the prophets, saying, Prophesy not.'

'They hate him that rebuketh in the gate, and they abhor him

that speaketh uprightly.'

Let us see what they become when the artist has touched them:—

'The Israelite nation could not, however, be so much influenced by the moral turpitude as to allow it to obtain full sway over their morality. Justice and the pure worship of God still had followers who protested more and more strongly against the vices practised by the great, and who, though in humble positions, obtained a hearing. Almost a century had passed since the prophet Elijah, with flowing hair, had declaimed against the sins of Ahab and Jezebel; but the prophetic societies which he had founded still existed, and acted according to his spirit and with energy similar to his own. young, who are generally more ready to receive ideal impressions, felt a disgust at the increasing moral ruin which came on them, and assembled round the prophetic centres in Bethel, Gilgal, and Jericho. The generation which Elijah had reared and taught discarded these [sic] external symbols, but pursued the same Nazirite, frugal mode of life, and wore long flowing hair; but they did not stop at such outward signs, but raised their voices against the religious errors, against luxury and immorality. Sons became the moral judges of their fathers' customs. Youths gave up drinking wine, whilst the men revelled in the drinking-places. The youthful troop of prophets took the place of the warning voice of conscience. In the presence of king and nobles, they preached in the public assemblies against the worship of Baal, against immorality and the heartlessness of the Did their numbers shield them from persecution, or were there amongst the ranks of the prophets the sons of great people, against whom it was impossible to proceed with severity? Or was King Jeroboam more patient than the accursed Jezebel, who had slaughtered the prophets' disciples by hundreds, or did their words fall heedlessly on his ears? [sic-"oder schlug er ihre Worte in den In any case it is noteworthy that the zealous youths remained unharmed. The revellers only compelled them to drink wine and forbade them to preach; they derided the moral reformers

¹ This is not a part of the translation which has 'been done into English by various hands.' It has the advantage of being the work of the editress herself. It is with much diffidence, therefore, that we venture to suggest, in order that the English reader may see what the author means, 'The generation . . . while they accepted the external symbols of the Nazirites—the frugal mode of life and the flowing hair—did not stop at . . .'

ti

fi

ta

sa

of

'a

th

(V

the

ari

(R

Ph

at

of the

trai

who exposed their wrong doings, but they did not persecute them ' (vol. i. pp. 241-242).

Nor is it only in the picture as a whole that the transforming touch of the artist is felt. Details, also, are constantly found in new positions and seen under fresh lights. Have we hitherto been content to read in Hebrew and in English, 'And Elijah came unto all the people and said' (I Kings xviii. 21)? We are now to read, 'Elijah presided at the assembly, which he addressed, saying . . .' Have we listened to Elijah saying, 'I, even I only, remain a prophet of the Lord; but Baal's prophets are four hundred and fifty men' (v. 22)? We are now informed that 'the hundred prophets who had been hidden and kept in the caves of Carmel by Obadiah were also present' (vol. i. p. 209). Ahab's definite proposal to Jehoshaphat, 'Wilt thou go with me to battle to Ramoth-Gilead?' (1 Kings, xxii. 3), becomes, 'Ahab probably solicited his royal guest to aid him in recovering Ramoth-Gilead' (p. 212); and the graphic touch, 'And a certain man drew a bow at a venture, and smote the king of Israel between the joints of the harness: whereupon he said unto the driver of his chariot, Turn thine hand, and carry me out of the host, for I am wounded' (v. 34), reads, 'After crossing the Jordan with Jehoshaphat, Ahab was mortally wounded by an arrow as he stood on his war chariot, and he only possessed sufficient consciousness to order his charioteer to drive him out of the turmoil of battle' (p. 212). But examples of this kind are so frequent that no references to them are needed. Let us take one or two of another kind. Modern Assyriologists have taught us from the Bible and the inscriptions alike that there is no room for an Assyrian King Pul as distinct from Tiglath-Pileser, and that these are different names for one and the same person. We now read—and, of course, without a note of explanation or a hint of another view-that Tiglath-Pileser 'ascended the throne of Assyria after the death of King Pul, the last descendant of the royal house of the Derketades . . . (vol. i. p. 266). Most students of the New Testament have thought that Saul, who is also called Paul, belonged to the aristocratic tribe of Benjamin, and was a Hebrew of Hebrews (Rom. xi. 1; Phil. iii. 5), that he was a Pharisee and a son of Pharisees (Acts xxiii. 6), that he was brought up at Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the strictness of the law of the fathers (Acts xxii. 3); but now we read that 'he had a limited knowledge of Judæan [sic] writings, and was only familiar with the Scriptures through the Greek translation' (vol. ii. p. 225). St. Paul's view of his own con-

enced their

lowers

sed by

Oct.

k at

oung

and

him

earing. lowing ut the acted The ssions, n, and ericho. d these mode it such errors, dges of ilst the rophets resence against s of the or were people, Or was rho had ir words

lone into work of that we what the external ng hair—

e in den

youths

to drink

eformers

duct, addressed to persons who had witnessed it, is, 'I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some' (I Cor. ix. 19–22); his exposition of charity is usually considered sublime teaching (I Cor. xiii.); and his letters, speeches, and life have generally been thought to be models of tact and courtesy. But have we all been mistaken? Dr. Graetz assures us that 'he was excitable and vehement, could not endure any opposition to his opinions, and was one-sided and dictatorial in his treatment of those who differed from him in the slightest degree' (vol. ii. p. 225).

Our space will not allow us to enter into fuller details nor do we think that our readers would care to peruse them—of the way in which this work treats the 'original sources,' of the author's historical tact, of his criticism and his personal observation. We are now, perhaps, in a position to judge not unfairly of the value of his maxim, 'Die Kritik schärft das Auge, und die Autopsie regelt die Kritik.'

But we cannot bring to a close our remarks upon this part of the work without expressing our conviction and our sorrow that it is vitiated throughout by the fact that it is not an inquiry but an assertion; not the reverent investigation of the truths of divine history, but the positive enunciation of the principles of human philosophy. It is significant that the right order of building is inverted, that the superstructure is completed before the foundations are laid, that the History of the Jews from B.C. 160 to A.D. 1848 is finished before that of the Old Testament is commenced. It is an interesting study to see this historian of Judaism, this teacher of Rabbis, standing on the sacred ground of the early history of his race, with the Holy Text alone in his hand. He would wipe away every cobweb from the eye that he may see clearly. He has left behind him Breslau and Rabbis, Talmud and Targum, Mishnah and Gemara, Halachah and Haggadah; but he has not left behind him the subjective eye itself. It will see what it has been trained to see; and what is that? Dr. Graetz answers in many portions of his work, but we quote two passages which are important in themselves, as well as in the light which they throw upon Dr. Graetz's position. This is his account of the creed of Maimonides:

'Since Judaism, according to his views, was nothing more than revealed philosophy, it ought to dominate the beliefs and opinions of men as well as their religious and moral conduct; aye, the one more than the other, as morality has no value in itself, and is only the fruit of right knowledge. He, accordingly, assumed as certain and positive that Judaism defines for us not only what we must do, but

be un etc ou me pro un me fut gat

18

wl

tru

Jersin to fut cre bou act: nov bou reli

bro

pp.

'Je

acc

Jud yet now a tin that with

belie swea Fait trine ever curri only Juda first

the

shalt

Oct.

nave

save

ally

ters,

dels

Dr.

ient,

was

who

ils—

hem

rces,

per-

n to

ritik

part

orrow

ot an

of the

of the

it the

ure is

istory hat of

study

stande, with

away

le has

argum,

he has

ill see

Graetz

te two

This is

re than

nions of

ne more

only the

ain and

do, but

what we must believe; that it asserts certain ideas as irrefragable Maimonides drew up thirteen of such doctrines or articles of belief:-The belief in the existence of God; in His indivisible unity; in His incorporeality and insusceptibility of change; in His eternity and existence before the world; in His absolute claim to our adoration (Monotheism); in the prophetic inspiration of chosen men; in Moses being the greatest prophet, with whom no other prophet could be compared; in the divinity of the Torah; in its unalterability; in God's providence; in His just reward and punishment; in the future appearance of the Messiah; and, finally, in the future resurrection. Although these articles of faith rest on investigation, and therefore cannot claim unquestioning acceptance, yet, according to Maimuni, no one can be considered a true Israelite or Jew who does not acknowledge them all as true; he who denies a single one of them is a heretic (Min, Epicoros), he does not belong to the community of Judaism, and cuts himself off from the hope of future bliss. Maimuni thus, on the one hand, raised the Jewish creed to the height of reasoned knowledge, and, on the other, set bounds to the free development of thought. Hitherto religious action only was valued as the characteristic of Jewish life. Maimuni now called after the bold thinker a commanding "Halt;" marked the boundary line between belief and heresy, not in the firm province of religious practice, but in the loose ground of religious belief, and brought the ethereal element of thought under rigid formulæ' (vol. iii. PP. 474-475).

The following is taken from the account of Mendelssohn's 'Jerusalem':—

'It had been believed, in consequence of his ideas upon Judaism, that Mendelssohn, if he had not entirely broken away, had yet declared many things to be worthless, whilst on the contrary he now showed that he was in fact an ardent Jew, and would not yield a tittle of existing Judaism, either Rabbinical or Biblical; in fact, that he claimed the highest privileges for it. All this was in according to the contract of the contrac

with his peculiar method of thought.

'Judaism recognises the inner freedom of religious convictions. Original, pure Judaism therefore contains no binding articles of belief, no symbolical books, to which the faithful were compelled to swear and affirm their incumbent duty. Judaism does not prescribe Faith, but Knowledge and Recognition; and it insists that its doctrines be taken to heart. Within this despised sphere of religion everyone may think, suggest, and err just as he pleases without incurring the guilt of heresy. Its right of inflicting punishment begins only when evil minds wilfully transgress a law. Why? Because Judaism is not a revealed religion but a revealed legislation. Its first precept is not "thou shalt believe or not believe," but "thou shalt do or abstain from doing" (vol. v. pp. 385-6).

It is beyond the purpose of the present article to discuss the tenets of modern Judaism, which seems to be comprehen-

le

ai

m

ta

ro

at

of

of

M

Ta

B

of

th

be

the

Sa

ch

U

at Ei

Isr

Be

an

of

He

Cu

Kr

and

Cre

Co

'Is

the

and

pat

whi

the

whi

fear

sive enough to embrace the Talmudists of Jerusalem, the Chasidim of Russia, and the Agnostics of the New York Society of Ethical Culture, the dogmatic orthodoxy of Dr. Friedländer's recent treatise on Jewish Religion and the equally dogmatic anti-orthodoxy of the work now before us. It is strange indeed to find the seminaries of London and of Breslau giving forth such different sounds. It is stranger still to open The Form of Daily Prayers, according to the custom of the German and Polish Jews; as read in their Synagogues and used in their Families, and to read in fuller form than that which we have quoted the creed of Maimonides, every article commencing with the solemnly reiterated אני מאמין באמונה שלמה, I believe with a perfect faith; to think of the centuries during which the Shema of Deut. vi. 4 has formed the corner stone of Jewish faith and polity; to recall, in a word, the whole life of the Judaism of the past; and then to be told by a teacher of the very Rabbis who are to use and teach others to use the Articles of Faith (for the rubric preceding these tells us, 'The following are the Thirteen fundamental Articles of our Faith; and which every Jew ought firmly to believe, and rehearse daily') that 'Judaism . . . contains no binding articles of belief' . . . 'Judaism does not prescribe Faith, but Knowledge and Recognition.' We are not sure, indeed, that we know what is intended by religious Knowledge and Recognition apart from Faith; but we must let all this pass. Our present duty is simply to point out that the author of the treatise before us looks at the history of the Old Testament through media which must necessarily distort it. How far the distortion has gone may be seen from the few totally inadequate sentences in which the author treats of sacrifice (vol. i. p. 25). Even Wellhausen and Kuenen might have taught this Jewish teacher, the one that 'with the Hebrews, as with the whole ancient world, sacrifice constituted the main part of worship;' the other that

'we must not assert that the prophets reject the cultus unconditionally. On the contrary they too share the belief, for instance, that sacrifice is an essential element of true worship (Isaiah lxi. 7; Zech. xiv. 16–19; Mic. iv. 1 sqq.; Isaiah ii. 1 sq., xviii. 7, xix. 19 sqq., &c. &c.) The context always shows that what they really protest against is the idea that it is enough to take part in the cultus, that there is no inconsistency in devotional zeal coupled with neglect of Yaheve's moral demands, and that as long as his altars smoke and his sanctuaries are frequented his favour is sure.' (Cf. Jer. vii. 8 sqq., &c. &c.) <sup>2</sup>

Wellhausen, History of Israel, Eng. Trans., p. 52.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Kuenen, The Hexateuch, Eng. Trans., p. 176.

, the York of Dr. d the re us. n and anger to the their fuller aimoerated think 4 has recall, d then to use rubric n funought m . . . es not Ve are ligious e must nt out history essarily n from author Luenen t 'with

nditionice, that lxi. 7; 7, xix. ey really e cultus, neglect oke and Jer. vii.

acrifice

When we pass from the Biblical period of our work we leave behind us that which is of first interest and first importance, though the almost miraculous story of this almost miraculous people appears as a thread running through the tangled web of all later history. It did not need the artistic power of Professor Graetz to invest with the charm of a romance, though he has not unfrequently invested with fresh attractions, the story of the schools at Tabne and Babylon; of the Amoraim; of the settlements in Europe and Arabia; of the Geonim; of Karaism; of Saadiah and Chadlai; of the culture in Spain; of the Crusades; of the epoch-making Maimuni; of the rise of the Kabbala; of the burning of the Talmud; of the Zohar; of the expulsion from France; of the Black Death; of the Marranos; of the Inquisition in Spain; of the expulsion from Spain and Portugal; of settlements in Turkey, Poland, Holland, Hamburg; of the persecution by the Cossacks; of the resettlement in England, of Manasseh ben Israel, of Scaliger, the Buxtorfs, Selden, and Vossius; of the Sceptics, Leon Modena and others; of Spinoza and Sabbatar Zevi, opposite as the poles but held together in one chapter of this History; of Simon, Surenhuysius, Basnage, Unger, Wolf, Toland; of the debased condition of the Jews at the end of the seventeenth century; of the age of Luzzatto, Eibeschütz, and Frank; of Lessing and Mendelssohn; of Israel Baalshem and his followers; of the Measfim and the Berlin salon of Henrietta Herz; of the French Revolution and the emancipation of the Jews; of the Paris 'Synhedrion;' of the 'Hep, Hep' 1 persecution in Germany; of Börne and Heine; of the 'Young Israel' reform and the 'Society of Culture;' of the revival under Jost, Riesser, Stenheim, Krochmal, Luzzatto, Geiger, and others; of the year 1840 and the Blood accusation at Damascus; of Montefiore, Cremieux, Munk, Sachs, the Reform movements, the Breslau College, the 'Alliance Israélite,' the 'Union of American-Hebrew Congregations,' the 'Anglo-Jewish Association,' the 'Israelitische Allianz,' the rapid social advance of the Jews, the rise of 'Anti-Semitism.' Are not all these things told, and many more than these things, in bold English type in the massive volumes before us? Are they not told with all the patriotic earnestness of one who believes that the thread which he is tracing is a thread of gold, darkened here and there indeed on the surface but still of gold, compared with which all the rest of the web is veriest dross? Yes; but we fear we must not be carried away with all this enthusiasm.

1 1.e. Hierosolyma est perdita.

We must recur to our old complaint that through all this vast field of intricate historical investigation the English reader is not supplied with an authority or a reference from beginning to end. Is he referred for them to the German volumes? He will then again be far from finding chapter and verse for every statement that is made; and of what use, moreover, is the English if every reader is supposed to have and is able to use the German? It again remains that he must accept all this on the ipse dixit of the author, but he may find it a little difficult to do so. He has met him on known ground and has seen what he makes of his 'source-writings,' how details shape themselves, how a whole picture is coloured by his artistic touch. He knows the author's methods when he can follow him; this knowledge is the key to them when he cannot follow him. For the earlier portions of the post-Biblical period he may doubt whether anything approaching complete records exist; and of some later portions the records may seem to be of individual and family rather than of national life. He may remember, perhaps, the opinion of Dean Milman, the English historian of the Jews, who was singularly well qualified to judge:

'Like the Wandering Jew of the legend, the nation might be the calm witness of the revolution of ages, the chronicler of all the untold vicissitudes. But of history in its highest sense, Jewish literature is absolutely barren. The historical faculty seems to have been altogether wanting. As if, either in their pride or their misery, they had obstinately or desperately closed their eyes to all but the narrow concerns of their own race, they have left us no trustworthy record even of their own interworking into the frame of society, their influence, their commerce, their relations to the rest of mankind. Still more, of their degradation and their sufferings they have preserved but broken and fragmentary notices, hardly to be dignified with the name of history. 1 There are traditions of their Babylonian Principality, of the rise and fall of their schools in Palestine and in the East; but of their influence in the great struggle between Mohammedanism and Christianity, when they stood between the decaying civilization of the East and the dawning civilization of the Arabian dynasties at Damascus and Bagdad, there is nothing which can even compare with a Monkish Chronicler, far less with the works of a Froissart, a Comines, a Villani.

the leger wone Of t know acco Heb could Jose

1892

auda Geric that it wa Chro conc those cloud work reade ben quen

chief

autho

which

to w
the getta
1856
ben
again
stand
of at

toge serie deed here whic

earli

<sup>1 &#</sup>x27;A thousand years had been suffered to elapse without the appearance of a single historian; but when the Rabbins saw that the antiquity, that is, the authenticity, of their traditions became doubtful, and was disputed by the anti-traditionists, they attempted to demonstrate their antiquity by a meagre catalogue of generations, always opening with the year of the Creation, by which they pretended they had preserved an unbroken line of tradition.'—Disraeli, Genius of Judaism, p. 9.

Oct.

vast

er is

ning

nes?

e for

er, is

ole to

it a

ound

how

ed by

en he

en he

post-

ching

cords

an of

on of

o was

ht be

of all

Jewish

o have

nisery,

out the

worthy y, their

inkind.

ve pre-

gnified

vlonian

and in

etween

een the

of the

g which e works

earance

ity, that

disputed intiquity year of

nbroken

'Even in their early narratives, of their fall in the war of Titus, of the insurrection under Bar-cochab, history is so overgrown with legend, truth is so moulded up with fiction or with allegory, that we wonder less at their want, in later times, of grave and sober annals. Of their own historian, Josephus, they either knew little or chose to know little. His vernacular history, which he wrote, by his own account, in the language of his people, doubtless the Aramaic Hebrew of the day, seems soon to have perished. The Greek they could not, or would not, read. Of Justus, the rival and adversary of Josephus, they seem equally ignorant.

'But the place of Josephus was usurped by one of the most and acjust of romancers, who wrote under the name of Joseph hen

But the place of Josephus was usurped by one of the most audacious of romancers, who wrote under the name of Joseph ben Gerion, and is known in later times as Josippon. It is inconceivable that this strange rhapsody should be accepted as genuine history, as it was even by some of the most learned of the Jews. No Medieval Chronicle ever indulged in such bold latitude of anachronism. . . .

'The history of the calamities of the Jewish nation by Solomon ben Virga, a Spanish Jew, a physician, is trustworthy as to the events concerning which he may have received immediate traditions, and those which occurred in his own time. All above and beyond is clouded with fable. . . . Unquestionably the most valuable historic work of the Jews which has been made accessible to the European reader is the Chronicle, often cited in these pages, of Rabbi Joseph ben Joshua ben Meir. But this is the work of a late writer, subsequent to the Reformation, and therefore obtaining his knowledge chiefly from the remote and troubled stream of tradition . . . the author has thrown aside much of the fable and wild imagination which render almost worthless all other Rabbinical histories.'

Nor is this the opinion of Christian writers only. Hirsch, to whom Graetz had dedicated an early work on Gnosticism, 'the high-minded champion of *Historical Judaism*, the unforgettable teacher, the fatherly friend, is said to have asked in 1856, "What does Graetz know of the character of Jochanan ben Zakkai? What can Graetz know?" and we confess that again and again, as we have seen character after character standing out clear-cut, defined, marked with a Hegelian trinity of attributes, we have been inclined to ask similar questions.

'His work,' Geiger again is reported to have said of the earlier volumes, 'contains Geschichten, which are loosely strung together, but are not Geschichte.' His volumes consist of a series of stories, but they are not history. They contain, indeed, from time to time not a few acute observations, and here and there we meet wider estimates and generalisations, which go far to show that the author could have produced a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Milman, *History of the Jews*, 4th edit. vol. iii. pp. 450-4.
<sup>2</sup> *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. iv. No. 14, p. 173.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 176.

of th

of th

and

to ti

accu

trans

hims

work more nearly approximating to the true idea of history, but he seldom rises above the period with which he is dealing. rarely sees much beyond the chapter, hardly ever much beyond the volume. The work seems to us to have all the defects of one composed and published at intervals and never brought together as a whole. We have a great array of proper names and details of individual lives, interesting enough in themselves, which have no real bearing on the destiny of the The author has found or made a large number of biographical sketches and family records, important enough as preparatory studies, but not important enough to be preserved as distinct features in the national life. He has drawers full of more or less accurate family photographs and personal sketches; but even an artist cannot make a great picture by pasting them on canvas and gilding them.

Nor does the author's style bear the impression of the sober and deliberate judgment which would command our confidence. His wise and good men are so very wise and so very good, and it is strange how constantly they are Jews. His foolish and bad men are so very foolish and so very bad, and it is strange how constantly they are Christians. Far be it from us to withdraw any wreath which he has placed on the graves of his coreligionists; but it will illustrate the judgment which we have formed, and may be further accepted as a work of piety if we try to draw back some of the arrows

which he has cast at the dead bodies of Christians.

St. John of the Golden Mouth was surely never before described as one who 'thundered . . . with his bombastic and cynical oratory,' nor yet St. Ambrose of Milan as 'a violent official, ignorant of all theology, whom a reputation for violence in the church had raised to the rank of bishop '(vol. ii. pp. 620-1). It is new to us to read of Christianity in 'its oppressive, unlovely, inhuman form,' and to be told of 'Louis IX. of France, who had acquired the name of "the Holy" from the simplicity of his heart and the narrowness of his head,' and of 'Ferdinand III. of Castile, who . . . . was likewise recognised by the church as "the Holy," because he burnt heretics with his own hand' (vol. iii. p. 536). We are told of the Council at Basle that it 'despaired of being able to put an end to the dissoluteness and vice of the clergy and monks, but yet gave its attention to the Jews in order to lead them to salvation. Leprous sheep themselves, they yet sought to save unblemished lambs!' (vol. iv. p. 265); and of Leo X., whose Pontificate fell in a time when theological questions threatened to embroil all Europe,' that he 'knew perhaps less

ness the a the ( anot ende dark The amp sway than Chri its p for v arist Jewof th comi

(pp. and to excomp Berli bond thous over who sume is 'lii' on a

exist

Dr. Clangu

but a

who

nistory, lealing, lea

Oct.

of the and our e and so re Jews. ery bad, Far be acced on rate the accepted e arrows

astic and

a violent tion for op ' (vol. y in 'its told of of "the wness of . . . was cause he We are ing able ergy and r to lead et sought f Leo X., questions haps less

of these than did his cook' (ibid. p. 484). On earlier pages of the same volume it is said that 'the degenerate, inhuman, and degraded Christian communities of this period presumed to treat the modest, virtuous, and pious Jews as outcasts and accursed of God' (p. 175), and again, 'The dove had become transformed into a venomous snake, the lamb had taken to himself the passions of a rapacious beast. So much viciousness could not have been spontaneous in human character, in the adherents of Christianity; it must have been derived from the Christian teaching itself' (pp. 217-8). 'Cologne was,' at another time, 'an owls' nest of light-shunning swaggerers, who endeavoured to obscure the dawn of a brighter day with the dark clouds of superstition, hostile to knowledge' (p. 453). The last volume tells us, to give but two or three more examples, that 'the English episcopal church, which exercised sway over the English conscience, was even more intolerant than the Popery which it persecuted' (vol. v. p. 20); that 'the Christian Bible, with its monkish forms, its exorcism of devils, its praying brethren and heavenly saints, supplies no models for warriors who had to contend with a faithless king, a false aristocracy, and unholy priests;' that 'all causes of inveterate Jew-hatred, clerical intolerance, racial antipathy, lawlessness of the nobility, mercantile jealousy, and brute ignorance were combined against the Jews of Alsace, in order to render their existence in this century of enlightenment a continual hell' (pp. 367-8); that 'the debtors united with common ruffians and clergymen . . . . the villainous district magistrate strove to exasperate the populace against the Jews of Alsace. He composed a venomous work against them' (p. 371); that the Berlin Society of (Jewish) Friends, 'Broken loose from the bond of a national religion which had kept them together for thousands of years, superficial reasoners and profligates passed over to Christianity in a body. "They were like the moths, who fluttered around the flame, till they were finally consumed"' (pp. 444-5). Nor are these flowers of language reserved for Christians only: Voltaire, to take but one instance, is 'like a low-minded Harpagon, who clung to his money,' and 'on account of this large or small loss hated not only the Jews, but all people upon the earth.' He is a 'diabolical genius' who gave 'a filthy commission to a Jewish jeweller.' He is a 'scamp, who was both a poet and philosopher' (p. 359).

We remember to have heard an eminent coreligionist of Dr. Graetz expressing his opinion on the merits of a third, in language which English writers are not often accustomed to use of each other, and which seemed to be at least sufficiently

b

a

0

a

W

SI

di

S

to

st

gi

01

in

in

th

re

vc of

strong. He suddenly paused, and said, 'English or German will not express it. I will tell you in Hebrew!' We have given our readers a few specimens—and we have noted many more, and some coarser—of Dr. Graetz's vocabulary, as it appears in a revised form in English after it has passed through the mind of a lady. We wonder what it would have been in Hebrew, and whether this method of speech is hereditary, or if there is authority for it in the *Quellenschriften*. If there is, we must be allowed to think that it is not quite proved that the *religion* of the Jews was always the cause

which made them unwelcome neighbours.

We are sorry to be obliged to add that it is not the author's exaggerated language only which makes us feel that we are not on safe ground when we commit ourselves to his guidance. In both the German and English volumes there are not a few mistakes, which we will charitably suppose are accidental, though this implies an amount of carelessness which is in itself not reassuring, but misprints can hardly occur in the German and in the translation of the same passage. The very strong assertions about Origen and the LXX (vol. ii. pp. 492-3) lose not a little of their force, for example, by the mention of 'Pantæus' (sic) as head of the Christian school at Alexandria, while the translator's reference to Cotys as 'king of Asia Minor' —and these instances find too many fellows both in the German and in the English—surely reveals a quite unusual amount of ignorance.

It will follow from more than one reference in the course of this article that we consider the translation to be quite unworthy of a work of this magnitude and this pretension to scholarship. In passage after passage is the meaning missed; in not a few it is difficult to know what meaning is intended; in several there are additions to the English vocabulary. The pages bristle with learned references to Hebrew terms, but even here the same strange carelessness prevails. We should be sorry to express our own Gentile opinion against that of so many learned Hebrews; but it cannot be correct to write 'Synhedrion' generally (vol. i. p. 449; vol. iv. p. 213), now 'Synhedrim' (vol. i. p. 448).<sup>2</sup> We do not think that *Chassidin* (passim), on the one hand, or Hakaton (vol. ii. p. 361) on the other, is quite right; but we are sure that we ought not to find

Vol. ii. p. 197. The German is here correct—'Kleinarmenien.'
Dr. Graetz writes neither, but the ordinary English form, 'Sanhedrin,' in his Lecture on Historic Parallels in the Publications of the Anglo-fewish Historical Exhibition, 1888. The translator is Mr. Joseph Iacobs.

German le have d many y, as it passed ıld have is herechriften, ot quite e cause

not the feel that s to his es there pose are elessness lly occur passage. X (vol. ii. e, by the school at as 'king fellows ls a quite

ne course be quite ension to missed; ntended; ary. The erms, but e should st that of. t to write 13), now Chassidin 1) on the ot to find

enien.' Sanhedrin, the Anglo-Ir. Joseph

Torah generally and Thorah twice on one page (vol. i. p. 376). There is, we believe, a language which is called Yiddish, but we cannot profess to have much personal knowledge of it. We are told that it consists of a mixture of Hebrew, Polish, Russian, German, English, or any other locally known language, and that it is the common tongue of the poorer Jews. We are inclined to think that there must be a kind of cultured Anglo-Yiddish. It would be difficult to know for what people, except those acquainted with such a tongue, the following passage of this translation was penned: 'Tanchuma bar Abba, the chief supporter of the later Agada, is the last Halachic authority of Judæa. There also, as in Babylonia, the last Amoraim collected the traditions and planned and arranged the Jerusalem, or, more correctly, the Judæan or Western Talmud (Talmud shel Erez-Israel, Gemara di Bene

Ma'araba) ' (vol. ii. p. б19).

But we must draw our task to a close, for we are in danger of exceeding the limits which can be devoted to our subject. It has been in many respects one of much sadness. It has been a matter of very sincere regret that we have not been able to speak in more commendatory terms of the work of one who has recently died, honoured we believe, by all who We are not among those who had that privilege, knew him. and we cannot therefore join actively in their chorus of lament and praise; but, standing passively at a distance, we would gladly echo it. We have been examining not the life of Dr. Graetz, who is just dead, but his History of the Jews, which in its present form is just born; and it is our duty to speak of that work in terms which we conceive to be just. We have tried also to find ground for speaking in commendatory terms of the work of Miss Bella Löwy and her 'various hands,' by whom this work has 'been done into English.' She must forgive us if we have failed, and she must allow us to say that such a work requires far more serious preparatory studies and more careful execution than seem to have been given to her volumes. If she were to compare her translation with that of Ewald's History of Israel or Schürer's History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (which is in part the work of a lady) she would understand our meaning; and she would also probably come to the conclusion that it would be kind to the memory of Dr. Graetz not to re-edit the portion of his work which is covered by these volumes. A new and more careful edition of the later portion of the work, with all the original notes and others added to them—and space may be found for this by the omission of superfluous adjectives—may be of some permanent value; but even then it could not become more than a contribution towards the work of the future historian of the Jews. Dean Milman concludes his own too brief *History of the Jews* by the following words, which the work of Dr. Graetz verifies in a remarkable way:

'As in poetry so, it would seem, in history, a man must cease to be a Jew to take a place in the goodly catalogue of the annalists of the world. Had Neander remained a Jew, would he have aspired to the rank which he now so justly holds as the historian not of the events only, but of the intimate spirit of Christianity? I would gladly hail a Jewish Neander; but even Jost (and I am too deeply obliged to Jost not to do him ample justice) will hardly fill that place which no Christian, perhaps, has a right to occupy—not even Ewald in the earlier scenes of Jewish History, certainly not Basnage in the later, least of all one like myself, who began too early, and has been called off too much by other studies, fully to appropriate or worthily to execute this work of universal, of perpetual interest to mankind' (vol. iii. pp. 454-5).

But our chief cause of sorrow in reading this book lies deeper than the execution of either the author's or the translator's task. It is in the whole conception and presentation of God's people Israel. Dr. Graetz thinks that there have been two great nations known to history—the Hebrew and the Greek, and that the Greek is not really great. And what is his greatness of Israel? Law without sacrifice, Temple without altar, Prophecy without fulfilment, Righteousness and Peace without a Messiah, the Old Testament without a New Testament, Judaism without faith. He presents a final picture from tradition of the rejuvenescence of the Jewish race:

'At the gates of Rome there lies a human form, clothed in rags, leprous, half dead, an object of horror and pity. Suddenly, this abject figure is touched with a staff, on which Biblical sentences are inscribed. He rises, his hideous coverings and disfigurements vanish, and he stands erect in the beautiful glow of youth' (vol. v. p. 784).

But what is the teaching of Biblical sentences? Let the prophet Amos answer:

'She has fallen: no more shall the virgin of Israel raise herself' (cap. v. 2).

'In that day I will raise the tabernacle of David that has fallen' (cap. ix. 11).

1 'To one of the fine arts alone, the enchanting science of music, the Jews have made vast contributions; but even in music the son [sic, but? grandson] of Mendelssohn had passed over to Christianity before he achieved his immortal fame.'

of the He tab

189

Ar

let

Zo

aga inhi alti effe men "Si

AR

2.

fam the to con Bra me

It of a

ma

Oct.

lue;

tion

)ean

s by

es in

se to

ts of

ed to

the

ould

eeply

that

even

nage l has e or st to

lies ans-

tion

nave

and

vhat

nple

and

New

final

wish

rags,

this are

nents

ol. v.

the

e the

c, the

Sic,

efore

And let one whose authority Dr. Graetz would not question, let the disciple of R. Akiba, let the 'Great Light' of the Zoar, expound these sentences. R. Simeon ben Jochai says:

"She has fallen, and shall no more (by herself) raise herself virgin of Israel," from want of strength to oppose against her adversaries, therefore it will be necessary that God, in his beneficence, raise her. He therefore promises in the other verse, "I will raise the fallen tabernacle of David," which is Jerusalem; as it says, "In Salem was his tabernacle," for which reason the prophet says again, "I will turn again the captivity of my people Israel, and they shall build and inhabit the waste cities, and they shall plant vineyards." Therefore, although by natural means Israel cannot raise herself, it may be effected miraculously; for undoubtedly the tabernacle of David, mentioned in the latter text, refers to what he had previously said, "She has fallen."

## ART. IV.—STATUTES OF LINCOLN CATHEDRAL.

 Statutes of Lincoln Cathedral, arranged by the late Henry Bradshaw, some time Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and University Librarian. With Illustrative Documents. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press by CHR. WORDSWORTH, M.A. Part I. containing the complete Text of Liber Niger, with Mr. Bradshaw's Memorandums. (Cambridge, 1892.)

Statuta Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Lincolniensis. Novum Registrum et Laudum. (Londini, 1873. Privately printed.)

THE riches of the capitular muniment room at Lincoln are familiar to all those who have directed their attention to the early history of our English cathedral system. Indeed, to quote the words of the great scholar to whom the original conception of the book before us is due, the late Mr. Henry Bradshaw, 'few muniment rooms can boast of such an immense store of precious materials as Lincoln.' <sup>2</sup>

But till a comparatively recent period the value of these materials was but little recognized even by their official custodians, and they were a sealed book to the outside world. It is true that they had been rescued from the horrible state of neglect to which the contents of such repositories had been almost universally consigned during the last century, when,

<sup>2</sup> Statutes of Lincoln, p. 83.
VOL. XXXV.—NO. LXIX.

H

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Manasseh Ben Israel, The Conciliator, ed. Lindo, pp. 225-6.

T

in

th

M

18

the

do

the

pre

is 1

late

of

the

doc

imp

be

the

face

to 1

scri

mos

poss

men

othe

reje

Line

life (

in the words of the late Mr. Burtt of the Public Record Office. 'they had suffered from almost every evil that could afflict them,' and that they had been carefully lodged in a lofty and well-lighted chamber over the Galilee Porch, secure from damp and the inroads of mice, and that some rude attempt at arrangement has been made. But the collection was entirely destitute of catalogue or inventory, or any aid to direct the researches of the investigator, while a whole mass of miscellaneous documents, some of them of great value to the historian (such as the 'Convention for the Surrender of Rennes to Henry, Duke of Lancaster and Earl of Lincoln,' dated July 1, 1357, and others invaluable for local history), was indiscriminately huddled together in a chest labelled 'Useless Papers,' i.e. papers which had no connexion with the property and revenue of the Chapter, and were therefore regarded as valueless. The keen eye of Mr. Burtt at once recognized the importance of this despised rubbish heap, and steps were speedily taken by their official guardians to rescue them from neglect and the danger of destruction, and reduce them to some degree of order. A beginning having been thus happily made, the work was soon extended to the whole contents of the muniment room, of the nature and value of which no one at that time seemed to have any clear notion. Indeed, while the documents remained without any save the roughest attempt at arrangement, unsorted, uncatalogued, it was hardly possible to arrive at a definite idea of the collection as a whole, still less to determine the history, the succession, and relation to one another of the various documents, dating from different epochs, which claimed authority as the statutes of the cathedral body. was, indeed, a question, at one time rather hotly disputed, whether there was any body of statutes at all binding on the present Chapter, and if so, where they were to be foundwhether in the Liber Niger of the thirteenth century, embodying the older unwritten customs of the cathedral, or in the Novum Registrum of the middle of the fifteenth century. Mr. Bradshaw writes-

'Strange as it may appear, there is not yet the slightest evidence to be found that the Chapter has ever, during its whole history, been provided with a body of Statutes under seal. There seems, indeed, to be grave doubt, at the present moment, as to what are rightly to be considered Statutes of the Church, and what are not; whether allegiance of the Chapter is rightly due to the Novum Registrum drawn up by Bishop Alnwick in 1440, or to the older Registrum which had been current during the preceding two hundred years.

'The irresi which thing

a scie

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Archæological Journal, xxxviii. 310.

Office,

afflict

lofty

from

tempt

tirely

niscel-

torian

Henry,

1357,

nately i.e.

evenue

. The

nce of

ken by

nd the order.

as soon

om, of med to

mained

ent, un-

re at a

deter-

another , which

isputed,

on the found—

ry, em-

al, or in

century.

evidence

ory, been

s, indeed,

htly to be

ether the

Registrum

Registrum

red years.

dy. It

The history of the rival claims of these two documents is certainly interesting, and not a little instructive.' 1

The settlement of these two points, first, whether the Cathedral of Lincoln had a code of statutes still in proprio vigore; and secondly, which of the two rival codes claimed the allegiance of its members, was the task to which the late Mr. Henry Bradshaw—whose premature death in February 1886, in the very midst of his literary labours, left a void in the study of our mediæval literature the sense of which time does not lessen—almost accidentally set himself, and of which the volume under review, completed and prepared for the press by the loving care of Canon Christopher Wordsworth, is the outcome.

The inquiry was originally suggested by a request of the late Bishop Wordsworth for information with regard to a copy of Bishop Alnwick's Novum Registrum of 1440, preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College at Cambridge, which document the Bishop was then preparing for the press, under the impression-which Mr. Bradshaw's researches have proved to be erroneous—that it embodied the statutes still binding on the members of the cathedral body. When brought face to face with the manuscript, Bradshaw's unerring judgment led to the 'unexpected discovery'2 that it was 'no mere transcript of Bishop Alnwick's book, but an original copy of the most precious description, and full of a living human interest possessed by very few books of the kind. What with amendments of the hot-tempered Precentor' [Robert Burton] 'and others, and the running comments of the Bishop accepting or rejecting them, the whole scene in the Chapter-House at Lincoln was brought up so vividly before me that the very life of the people of the town seemed to be in the book.

"A book in shape, but really pure crude fact, Secreted from man's life when hearts beat hard And brains high-blooded ticked four centuries since."

'The temptation,' he continues, 'to pursue the search was irresistible, and in spite of the short and scattered opportunities which I have been able to devote to the work, I feel that something has been accomplished.'

'Something' indeed, and that far more than that mere settlement of a question which might appear to possess only a scientific value for a limited circle, which he originally proposed for himself, amounting, in fact, to the clearest and most comprehensive contribution to the history not only of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Statutes of Lincoln, p. 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ibid. pp. 4, 5.

I

tl

a

B

V

la as

la to

W

W

W

to

ou

of

me

ref

sui

litt

tha

pos

aid

ver

Bra

in

lau

sha

con

add

owr

The

due

doc

stud

and

work and

which

room

I cou

cathedral, which is its special subject, but of our secular foundations generally—their origin, their ritual, and the daily life of their members, from the highest to the lowest official-

for which we cannot be too grateful.

The further Mr. Bradshaw pursued the subject the keener did his interest in it become. 'I can truly say,' he wrote to his friend the present Archbishop of Canterbury in 1882, 'that I have never been engaged in such an intensely interesting piece of anatomical work.' 1 The work grew under his hands. He wrote and rewrote, printed, corrected and recorrected, but really finished nothing, and cast aside his proofs. In the words of Canon Wordsworth,2 'Bradshaw had not health and leisure to work out the problem' he had set himself 'so perfectly upon paper as he conceived it might be done. He was taken away before he had fully written out the main problem to his satisfaction.' He left 'piles of papers evidently intended for the press,' 'a few half-corrected proof-sheets,' others 'cancelled,' but nothing finished. His standard was too high to allow of any rapid progress with him. 'Le mieux était toujours l'ennemi du bien.' 'I cannot,' he said, 'turn out a piece of work clean with any rapidity,' and thus, to quote Canon Wordsworth again, 'his recast proofs never made any progress, but he wrote from time to time, and thus left sections in manuscript more valuable and more trustworthy than the most elaborate published work of many a student who has written more easily, for almost every line that came from his pen was in reality "clean work." '3

Had Mr. Bradshaw attempted this work twenty years before, the difficulties he must have encountered would have been far greater than they were; almost sufficient, indeed, to have baffled even his keenness of research. We have spoken of the former condition of the Lincoln muniment room, when it presented an almost undigested chaos. But before Mr. Bradshaw commenced his investigations the loving labours of the late Prebendary Wickenden 4 had to some extent transformed 'chaos' into 'cosmos;' sorted, cleaned, and labelled the contents of the rubbish heap, sifted and arranged

<sup>1</sup> Statutes of Lincoln, p. 2. <sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. vi. <sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. vii. <sup>4</sup> The Rev. Joseph Frederick Wickenden, M.A., Trinity College,

XUM

Cambridge, was collated by Bishop Wordsworth to the prebendal stall of Norton Episcopi in Lincoln Cathedral in 1876, as a recognition of the value of the work he had gratuitously undertaken in the arrangement of the chapter muniments. Having devoted a great part of ten years to this labour of love, identifying and assorting the various documents with painstaking accuracy, and labelling them with exquisite skill and neatness, he died with his work not fully completed October 26, 1883.

daily cial—

Oct.

ceener ote to , 'that esting hands. ed, but In the th and so per-He main idently sheets, was too mieux urn out quote ide any sections han the vho has from his

y years

lld have
deed, to
e spoken
m, when
fore Mr.
labours
e extent
ned, and
arranged

p. vii.
by College,
endal stall
ition of the
ngement of
en years to
ments with
I and neat-

the so-called 'libri vetusti et inutiles' which filled the presses, and prepared the field in which future investigators might pursue their researches without baffling confusion and needless loss of time. Of Mr. Wickenden's 'helpful guidance' Mr. Bradshaw speaks with warm gratitude.¹ And the 'Rough Inventory' of its MS. treasures, which was one of Bradshaw's latest works in connexion with Lincoln, is described by him <sup>2</sup> as 'a first attempt to take stock of the patient and long work which Mr. Wickenden bestowed upon them during the last years of his life; an attempt to render his labours of use to others, whether those who wish to study what is here or to those who may try to carry on the work which he began so well.'

The mantle both of Mr. Bradshaw and Prebendary Wickenden has happily fallen on Mr. Christopher Wordsworth, the worthy inheritor of a name which will never cease to be honoured in the Church of England, who has carried out his predecessors' unfinished work with the same patience of research, lucidity of description, and accuracy of arrange-By him not only has the 'Rough Inventory' already referred to, begun by Mr. Bradshaw (which, as might be presumed, coming from one so impatient of incompleteness, is little deserving of the qualifying epithet), been completed, so that for the first time the chapter muniment room at Lincoln possesses a complete guide to all its MS. treasures, but, aided by the liberality of the syndics of the Cambridge University Press, he has given to the world the results of Mr. Bradshaw's labours in a form worthy of the subject, and in a manner which, to adopt his own words, 'no choice of laudatory epithets could describe beyond its due.' Bradshaw's somewhat fragmentary materials have been reduced to consecutive order, and rendered clearly intelligible by the addition of supplementary and intercalary matter from his own learned pen, modestly distinguished by a smaller type. The task undertaken by Mr. Wordsworth required for the due accomplishment an intimate acquaintance with the documents themselves, only to be gained by long and patient study, as well as with the documents of other cathedral bodies and with mediæval ritual, possessed by very few. Mr. Wordsworth deserves our warm thanks for grappling with so difficult and laborious a work, and for the clearness and judgment with which he has accomplished it.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 'His intimate acquaintance with the contents of the muniment room enables me to economize every moment of the scanty leisure which I could afford.'

<sup>2</sup> Statutes of Lincoln, p. viii.

de

W

CC

of

TI

bo

are

qu

tui

to

hir

ing

the

bo

the

pai

catl

eve

by the

Wil

131

sen

mir

can

noti

edit

Rol

The main subject of the volume is, as we have indicated, the elucidation of the history of the *Liber Niger*, or *Black Book*, and of the *Novum Registrum*, and the settlement of their rival claims to be regarded as the Statute Book of the Chapter of Lincoln.

Of these documents the Liber Niger is the earlier. The date of its original compilation is given by Mr. Bradshaw as the early part of the fourteenth century. But this is only the time of its reduction to writing. It contains matter of much earlier date, reaching back probably to the foundation of the Chapter by Remigius, not long after the Conquest. Unwritten custom in early times, both in civil and religious matters, to a large extent took the place of written law, and was regarded as equally binding. That the Black Book itself claimed no higher authority than a formal declaration of existing customs is shown by the quotation from Isidore 1 (but to be found much before his time in Tertullian,2 who himself probably derived it from some earlier jurisconsult), which stands in its pages as its motto,3 'Consuetudo est jus quoddam moribus institutum, quod pro lege suscipitur cum defecit lex, nec differt an racione an scriptis consistat.' For the first two centuries and a half of their existence the Chapter of Lincoln appear to have been content with an unwritten code. No attempt to reduce their customs to writing would seem to have been made before the early part of the thirteenth century (c. 1213). The history of this reduction is a curious one, and illustrates the high position then held by the Chapter of Lincoln, with which, we are told, even Continental ecclesiastics of the time felt it an honour to be connected 'vel perexili filo.' At this time Bricius, Bishop of Moray in Scotland (1203-1221), was establishing a miniature chapter of eight canons in his newly-settled Cathedral of Spyny.4 He felt that he could not do better than take the great Church of Lincoln as his model. So the newly-appointed dean and chancellor were despatched on a long journey southward to visit Lincoln and learn on the spot what were the 'privileges and immunities' in which it was their ambition to share, and what 'the customs' to be subject to which was, in the Bishop's view, the surest way to provide for the well-working of his new constitution. A letter was written by the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln in answer to the request for information, of which a copy has fortunately been preserved in the Moray

<sup>1</sup> Isid. Hispal. Etymolog. lib. ii. c. 10, lib. v. c. 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Tertull. De Corona Milit. c. 4.

<sup>3</sup> See Statutes of Lincoln, pp. 419-20. 4 Ibid. p. 40.

Oct.

cated.

Black

nt of

of the

The

Ishaw

his is

natter

lation

quest.

igious v, and

Book ration

idore 1

o him-

which oddam

it lex, st two

f Lin-

le. No

eem to h cen-

curious

Chapter

l eccle-

ed 'vel

n Scot-

pter of

4 He

Church

an and

vard to

ivileges

are, and Bishop's of his

an and mation,

Moray

Liber Decani, the main articles of which have been printed in Wilkins's Concilia.1 The facts, says Mr. Bradshaw, are these.

'The envoys were received in the Chapter House and submitted definite articles of enquiry. To these they received a clear and unhesitating answer, and the words by which this answer is introduced seem to me to point to the fact that the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln were not sending a transcript of a Consuetudinarium of their own, but were writing down a statement of their customs in answer to definite questions on the part of the Dean and Chapter of Moray. . . . The whole narrative contained in the Lincoln letter seems to show that this collection of Consuetudines was then first committed to writing for the very purpose of being sent to Scotland.'2

This body of 'customs,' having been now for the first time committed to writing, was entered on a blank page at the end of the old Martilogium, or 'Martyrology,' of the Chapter, portions of which book being read every day after prime in the Chapter House, the record would be easily accessible whenever any appeal to 'the customs' of the church was required. This book probably shared the fate of all 'Popish service books' in the reign of Edward VI., and is now lost, but we are fortunate enough to have two copies of the document in question, both made in the early part of the fourteenth century, about 1320-1330 at the latest. One of these is in 'Antony Beek's Book,' written by or for that dignitary while Canon of Lincoln, owned by him when Dean, and taken with him to Norwich when he became bishop of that see, but finding its way back again to its original home in the middle of the last century.3 The other copy is in John of Schalby's 4 book, also preserved in the chapter muniment room, under the misleading title of Martilogium. It consists of twelve paragraphs, detailing the previously unwritten customs of the

1 It is a curious fact illustrative of the complete oblivion into which cathedral muniments had fallen, and the want of interest felt in them even by the learned world, that, until the printing of the Novum Registrum by Bishop Wordsworth, the only available source of information as to the early Lincoln statutes was in the Moray document as printed by Wilkins.

Statutes of Lincoln, pp. 40-3.
 Antony Beek, or Beke, became Canon of Lincoln 1313, chancellor 1316, Dean 1329, Bishop of Norwich 1337. The manuscript was pre-

sented to the Chapter by Gilbert Bennett, June 3, 1754.

4 Schalby was a contemporary of Beeke, and, like him, a great admirer of the popularly canonized bishop John of Dalderby. He was canon from c. 1300 to c. 1333, holding the stall of Dunham. He was also registrar to Bishop Oliver Sutton (d. 1299). His short biographical notices of the early bishops of Lincoln have been published under the editorship of the late Prebendary Dimock in the seventh volume of the Rolls issue of Giraldus Cambrensis (vii. 193-216).

n

t

C

b

iı

a

0

0

C

m

ti

as

to

se

(S

of

in

are

on

fac

kin

pr

Church as observed by a member of the Chapter during the early portion of the fourteenth century. Soon after this time the Dean and Chapter seem to have come to the determination that it would be more in accordance with the importance of such a record to give up the haphazard way of entering their consuetudines on the blank leaves of service books, and to draw up 'a separate book which should serve as a register and nothing else, which should contain the "uses" of their Church in their latest form, and which should be preserved in the vestry under the guardianship of the treasurer.' In accordance with this resolution a book was prepared, known from its binding as the Liber Niger, or Black Book and from its contents the Liber Consuetudinarius Ecclesia, which, though long supposed to be lost, was happily discovered among the contents of the cathedral muniment room, and identified by Mr. Bradshaw. With loving care he deciphered and transcribed the whole document with the additional entries made from time to time, and from his transcript with not inferior devotion it has been edited and published by Mr. Wordsworth, constituting, with the various charters, awards, commissions, chapter acts, and other miscellaneous documents, the last 134 pages of the present volume. Under Mr. Bradshaw's eye the precious volume was exquisitely rebound in a manner revindicating its old name of Liber Niger, whereas, in Mr. Bradshaw's words, it had been 'until 1883 disguised in a common parchment binding, and was looked upon as an ordinary manuscript of unknown date, bearing on its back the distinguishing mark "X," a designation aptly symbolizing its condition for the past two hundred years as the "Great

By the compilation of the *Liber Niger* the Chapter of Lincoln was thus for the first time put in possession of a written code of statutes which would have an indisputable authority on any disputed question far beyond that of traditionary custom. As rather hazy views prevail as to the nature and origin of cathedral statutes, and grave doubts have been thrown on the power of capitular bodies to change existing or enact new statutes, it may be desirable to get a clear notion of what a cathedral statute was taken to be in these early times, and in whom the power of enacting it was considered to reside. Mr. Bradshaw thus defines it:

'It was a provision made to supply the defects of the unwritten custom, discussed and agreed upon by the Dean and Chapter, and receiving the assent of the bishop, the constitutional head of the whole

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Statutes, &c., p. 55.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 57.

Oct.

g the

s time

nation

of such

onsue-

aw up

othing

n their

vestry

rdance

om its

om its

though

ng the

ied by

l tran-

entries

not in-

by Mr.

awards,

docu-

der Mr.

ebound

hereas,

ised in

as an

ts back

bolizing

"Great

pter of

on of a

sputable that of

s to the

ots have

ge exist-

a clear

in these

vas con-

unwritten

pter, and

Cathedral Body, much as the bills discussed and agreed upon in Parliament become law on receiving the Royal assent. The statute is made, as a statute, by the Dean and Chapter, and in those cases where it is thought necessary the Episcopal assent is added, and this, again in the most important cases of all, is ratified by the Bishop's seal. But for all the ordinary purposes of home government, the agreement of the Dean and Chapter was amply sufficient, and no further sanction by the Bishop was required.' 1

How far this initiatory power has been taken away by more recent statute law, and what authority cathedral bodies now possess of modifying their statutes in accordance with the requirements of the age, and of enacting new statutes with the view of rendering the cathedrals and their chapters more widely useful as centres of diocesan work, is a matter for grave consideration by those bodies themselves, as well as by would-be ecclesiastical legislators. Perhaps it will appear on due investigation that no such restriction on their corporate action as is commonly supposed exists, and that they have the power of self-reform; always, in wise and able hands the best kind of reform. Solvetur ambulando.

It is not a little interesting to learn that the earliest recorded instance of a cathedral statute to be found at Lincoln is that which regulates the daily recitation of the Psalter by members of the chapter.<sup>2</sup> This dates from the last five years of the twelfth century, 1195–1200, when St. Hugh was Bishop and Roger de Rolveston Dean of Lincoln. Such a distribution of the Psalter for daily recitation had prevailed at Lincoln, as in many ecclesiastical foundations, both monastic and secular, from the earliest times, and may probably be assigned to the first Bishop, Remigius. The first trace of this is in an entry in the grand manuscript copy of the Vulgate <sup>3</sup> presented, as an inscription at the head of the first page testifies, by Nicholas, Canon and Archdeacon, whom we may safely.

1 Statutes, p. 38.

<sup>2</sup> This statute is printed, with the psalms assigned to each stall

(Statutes, pp. 300-6).

s It is not a little interesting to notice that this copy of the Holy Scriptures bears the title, which we find in Jerome, 'Bibliotheca,' instead of the later 'Biblia.' We have been recently reminded of the suggestive teaching of this name by Professor Kirkpatrick, in his delightful and instructive little volume, for which the thanks of every Biblical student are due, The Divine Library of the Old Testament. 'It reminds us at once,' he says (p. 41), 'that we have in the Bible not one book but many . . . It is worth while to revive the older title in order to emphasize the fact that the Bible is indeed a collection of literature of the most varied kind. History, codes of law, oratory, poetry, philosophy speculative and practical, epistolary correspondence public and private, are included in it.'

the whole

d

0

W

u

a

so

ir

CO

la

as

W

po

m

of

identify with the first Archdeacon of Huntingdon, appointed by Remigius himself, Henry of Huntingdon's predecessor. In this we find the names of all the then canons and the psalms assigned to them, the Bishop occupying the first place as the chief of all the canons, the arrangement apparently corresponding to that of the Norman Choir. In the lax and careless times that succeeded, this goodly custom had so entirely dropped out of use that the assignment of the psalms to particular stalls had been lost. Though we have no direct evidence of the fact, we can hardly be wrong in tracing the influence of St. Hugh in its revival. To save the canons from the peril of violating the oath which bound them to this daily recitation, an order was drawn up by the Dean and other 'discreet men,' members of the Chapter, and passed by the whole body, Hugh being himself present and as Bishop confirming the order, reassigning the psalms among the fifty-four canons, the first three, now reduced to one, being reserved for the Bishop himself. This distribution, with some alterations rendered necessary by the creation of new prebends, continues to be observed to the present day. Each of the prebendaries of Lincoln has his own allotted psalms, whose titles, as at St. Paul's, are inscribed on tablets suspended at the back of his stall, and the closing act of his installation is the direction of his installer to turn and read them and to bear in mind that he is bound to recite them daily 'if nothing hinders.' It is a cause of regret that the chief dignitaries of the cathedral are now shut out of this daily recitation by which the bond of common brotherhood is maintained, no psalms being assigned to them. The cause is so simple and admits of such easy redress that it is matter of surprise that the wrong has been so long allowed to continue. Formerly-indeed, up to the time when, almost in our own days, so many time-honoured customs were rudely upset by the well-intended but ignorant and blundering Cathedral Act, and the cathedrals themselves were only spared as picturesque survivals, more from sentiment than from any conviction of their utility—each of the dignitaries of Lincoln—Dean, Precentor, Chancellor, and Subdean-was also a canon of the church, holding a prebendal stall. On his admission, if not already a canon, the ceremony of installation consisted of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Mr. Bradshaw writes: 'The Bishop is, of course, a Canon among Canons, first of them, but always a Canon. What a misconception of the whole thing at Lincoln, Exeter, &c., to have separated their prebendal stalls from the Bishops and officers—all for nothing' (Statutes, p. 102).

ointed essor, d the first it apin the ustom ent of rh we wrong save bound up by apter, resent salms ced to oution, ion of t day. llotted ablets of his d read them: at the of this erhood cause tter of ntinue. ar own set by al Act, iresque tion of n, Preof the

Oct.

among nception ted their Statutes,

, if not

sted of

He was first admitted to his prebendal stall and was then bidden to advance to the place assigned to his dignity with the words 'Frater, ascende superius.' His prebendal office furnished him with psalms for daily recitation, and also gave him a place and voice in chapter, and a right to claim 'the greater residence.' Through the unhallowed suppression of the more richly endowed stalls in the general pillage of Edward VI.'s early days, the psalms allotted to their holders are never recited. Would it not be desirable for the Dean and Chapter to imitate the action of their predecessors seven centuries ago, and reassign these missing psalms to the dignitaries, and thus complete the now imperfect cycle of daily praise and intercession? Before we leave this part of the subject it may be mentioned that this laudable and time-honoured custom of the daily recitation collectively of the whole Psalter, 'which maintains the bond of brotherhood without imposing any excessive burthen,' is also found at St. Paul's, Salisbury, and Wells, and has been established, by the present Archbishop of Canterbury, when bishop of that see, in the Cathedral of Truro, 'as a memorial of fraternal unity in work and worship and as a spiritual intercession for the whole Church,' and by Bishop Ridding in his Cathedral of Southwell, 'not as a rule obligatory on the conscience, but as a help for the remembrance of their brotherhood.' are happy to learn that the same practice is being introduced among the clergy in the diocese of Ely, and, we believe, in some other dioceses, where, the Cathedral being of the new foundation, there is no body of prebendaries.

Before entering more fully upon the chief subject of his investigation, the gradual growth of the statutes of Lincoln Cathedral, Mr. Bradshaw sketches with masterly hand the origin and development of the non-monastic cathedrals, commonly known as those of 'the old foundation,' served, i.e., by a college of secular canons. This, we may remark, is the constitution of nearly all Continental cathedral bodies. England is, curiously enough, the only country where the place of a Dean and Chapter has been occupied by a monastic body—as at Canterbury, Durham, Winchester, Ely, and the like—the Bishop taking the place of the Abbot, the working head of the community being the Prior, and the electors to the see when vacant—commonly, however, with only a nominal power, overridden by the will of the sovereign—being the monks. No portion of Mr. Bradshaw's work will be found.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This allusion to St. Luke xiv. 10 is also found among the customs of St. Paul's Cathedral, *Statutes of Ralph de Baldok*, pars ii. c. 4.

I

b

n

li

W

F

W

C

0

W

t

I

t

b

1

Ł

more generally interesting than this. To many it will, we think, furnish entirely new light as to the origin and growth of the cathedral system. As Mr. Bradshaw says 1:

'We are so fully accustomed in England to cathedral bodies closely resembling this type [that of Lincoln] that we are apt to lose sight of the process by which they came to do so.'

This process he thus goes on to describe:

'The Capitulum or Chapter had originally been the body of clerici most nearly connected with the Episcopal see, and forming as such the Bishop's immediate council, just as the Pope and the College of Cardinals are to this day in theory the Bishop of Rome and the parochial clergy of the city. But by the latter part of the eleventh century this body had begun in many quarters to develop a substantive existence of its own. The need of an organization for the management of the mother church of the diocese, whether from the importance of that church or from the necessarily frequent absence of the Bishop, led to the creation of a systematic form of home government; and, in order to create and foster a due sense of responsibility it became a matter of good policy for the Bishops to confer very great powers and privileges upon the body to which this home government was intrusted. . . . In the secular foundations the scattered endowments of the Church were some of them reserved for the Communa or Common Fund of the whole Chapter, while others were assigned, one to each of the several canons as prabenda, and under this new arrangement the possession of a prabenda 2 became the outward visible sign of full membership without which no mere Canon could be considered to have any voice in the business of the Chapter.'

The body having been thus called into being, steps were gradually taken for its government and organization by the creation of a series of minor officials, each undertaking the management of one department under a chief officer, to whom was intrusted the rule over the whole. Such an organization did not spring into being at once, but was a gradual growth. As the late Mr. Freeman has said <sup>3</sup>:

'The things must have existed before. There must have been some recognized head in the absence of the Bishop, some one to manage the choir, some one whose especial charge was the ornaments and movable property of the church.'

By the organization introduced from Normandy by the new race of transmarine prelates summoned by the Conqueror to

<sup>1</sup> Statutes, chap. i. p. 31.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Præbenda is properly the amount of food allotted, the fodder with which the occupant of the stall was provided.

<sup>3</sup> Essays on Cathedrals, p. 142.

will, we growth

bodies to lose

f clerici as such llege of ind the leventh ubstanfor the om the ence of governisibility er very governattered for the others læ, and became o mere

s were by the ng the cer, to an orwas a

of the

n some manage its and

e new eror to

er with

be his instruments in the ecclesiastical government of his newly acquired realm

these duties were permanently assigned to distinct officers, holding for life places recognized as superior to their brethren, and who by virtue of these offices held a distinct prebend or separate endowment.'

The number, titles, and duties of these officers differ somewhat in various cathedrals, but the main outline is always the same. Four chief dignitaries are almost universally found.1 First, there was the Dean or Provost, the general head of the whole body, whose status and powers would vary with the character of the body over which he presided, but who was under any circumstances supreme. Secondly, the importance of the 'science of worship,' dealing as it did in those days with 'a delicate and highly complicated piece of mechanism then in full working order,' assigned the first place after the Dean to the officer whose duty it was to regulate the services, the Precentor, Cantor, or 'Chanter.' Thirdly, the Cancellarius or 'Chancellor'2 was the secretary and literary officer of the Chapter, the keeper of and lecturer in the theological school, then universally attached to a cathedral church as well as to a monastery, whose duty it was either to preach himself every Sunday and other specified days, or to provide a substitute among the Canons or other duly qualified persons,3 if such could be found, to keep the Chapter seal, and to write the Chapter letters and draw up the official documents. Fourthly, the list was closed with the Treasurer (Thesaurarius), not a treasurer in the modern sense as the manager of the funds of the body, but the keeper of the treasures of the church—the altarplate, shrines, crucifixes, jewelled monstrances, and the like, with which the sacristies of our cathedrals—notably that of Lincoln—and churches were so lavishly provided before the unhallowed pillage commenced by Henry VIII. and his rapacious ministers, and completed under the boy-king. Edward VI., when the caterpillar devoured what the locust had To this officer, at Lincoln, appertained also the care of

<sup>1</sup> Statutes, u.s. p. 32.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> A confusion is sometimes made between the Chancellor of the Church—always a canon, necessarily in holy orders—and the Chancellor of the Diocese, vicar-general or the legal officer of the Bishop, who may be, and now commonly is, a layman. It need hardly be said that the offices are quite distinct, and have no connexion with one another.

<sup>3</sup> Liber Niger, p. 284. 'Est autem prædicandum populo . . . et

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Liber Niger, p. 284. 'Est autem prædicandum populo . . . et hoc fiat per canonicos, sive per alios viros authenticos, si inveniantur qui velint vel sciant.'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 285. 'Thesaurarii officium est ornamenta et thesauros ecclesiæ conservare.'

pi

B

W

R

W

ar

lit

lif

e

la

k

I

C

b

C

d

Se

21

th

th

th

o d

q

the clock and bells, the lights, and the general superintendence of the services, and the provision of all things necessary for the due celebration of the ritual of the Church. <sup>1</sup>

Such, in brief outline, was the cathedral constitution, so 'beautifully ordered in itself,' 'but,' in Mr. Freeman's words,<sup>2</sup> 'containing the seeds of that separation of interests between the Bishop and the Chapter' which gradually deprived the cathedral of its true character as the mother church of the diocese, the invigorating centre of religious work, reduced the Bishop to the position of a barely tolerated visitant in his own see-church, forbidden to touch its ritual or organization with his little finger save on appeal, and robbed the Chapter of its essential character as the Bishop's Council, Senatus Episcopi.

We must now, with Mr. Bradshaw's help, inquire from what quarter this constitution was derived. For its source we must look across the Channel. Its origin was not English but Norman.

'As the period of the Norman Conquest of England is also the period of the development of Cathedral Chapters, we should naturally expect to find what in point of fact we do find, that the pattern followed by Norman Bishops would be that which they had known in their old home.' <sup>3</sup>

We cannot follow Mr. Bradshaw through all the steps by which he traces the development of the secular foundations, but refer our readers to his own luminous pages. He draws attention to an important fact, not hitherto sufficiently recognized, that the three great secular foundations of York, Lincoln, and Salisbury—'a triad of sister churches'—were all constituted by their Norman bishops, Thomas, Remigius, and Osmund, within a few months of one another, 1090-1091, and that 'the type of constitution thus formed acted 'as a pattern for all the secular chapters subsequently erected throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland.' 'Indeed,' he continues, 'had the Bishops assembled at Hastings in 1091 been formed, in modern fashion, into a Royal Commission for the erection of cathedral establishments, they could hardly have left their joint mark upon the Church of England more distinctly than they have done.'4

We must refer to Mr. Bradshaw's own pages for the proofs headduces ('to his delight and ours,' writes Mr. Wordsworth that the form of chapter then established in England had its

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Debet etiam invenire aquam, carbones, thus, phialas, et utensilia necessaria in ecclesia, ibid. p. 286.

cessaria in ecciesia, p. 143.

<sup>2</sup> Cathedral Essays, p. 143.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 35.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 75.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Statutes, p. 33. <sup>6</sup> Ibid. pp. 35, 36, 101, 106.

on, so ords,<sup>2</sup> ween l the

Oct.

of the d the sown with of its scopi. from ce we nglish

so the natuattern own in ps by tions,

ps by
tions,
lraws
y reYork,
-were
igius,
1091,
d 'as
ected
l,' he
1091
ission
ardly
more

oroofs orth <sup>6</sup>) ad its ensilia

106.

prototype, not at Rouen, from which Remigius is recorded to have derived the constitution of Lincoln, but primarily at Bayeux, which, though Rouen was the metropolitan church, was 'even in certain ways more considerable.' 'The three great codes of Lincoln, Sarum, and York came, not from Rouen, as the founders themselves believed, but only through Rouen from Bayeux.'

'For good or ill, this is the particular form of home government which we find freshly planted by the Bishops in our English Cathedral Churches on the eve of the opening of the twelfth century. From whatever point of view we look upon the twelfth century, it is an age of enormous energy, of revived life alike in religion and in literature. The effete monastic systems gave way before the strong life of the old orders reinvigorated and new orders founded. . . . Whatever was weak decayed; but whatever had strength to grow, grew with a force that nothing could resist; and the development of the capitular system in our Cathedral Churches is but one instance in a thousand of a vigour which was characteristic of the age.' <sup>2</sup>

To revert to Lincoln itself.

'Shortly before 1150 the new Bishop of Lincoln (Robert de Chesney) had been persuaded, on his accession to the see, to bestow on his Chapter the fullest privileges which had been accorded to the Chapter at Salisbury by their founder; and this example was followed by other Bishops both in England and Scot-No Bishop, no Archdeacon, no Diocesan officer of any kind, could thenceforth lift up a finger against any one, even a parishioner, living on this privileged ground. The Chapter House was the one place in which the offender could be brought to account. Immunities of this kind were granted by Bishop after Bishop, and confirmed by successive Popes, until by the middle of the thirteenth century, even the Bishop's ordinary duty of visitation had come to be looked upon as an intolerable infringement of the rights of the Chapter. The Bishop certainly appointed the Canons, and all the dignitaries except only the Dean, who was in most places elected freely by the Chapter; but with this the power of the Bishop seemed to reach its fullest limit. Certain kinds of statutes required, or at any rate received, the Bishop's assent; but as statutes were, for the most part, looked upon as a declaration of the 'ancient custom of the Church' which there was no gainsaying, it is clear that, during the whole of this period, the Dean and the rest of the Chapter, if only they could work harmoniously together, would find little difficulty in carrying everything before them.' 3

With what may be called 'the Battle of the Books,' i.e. the question, rather hotly mooted a few years back, whether there was any code of statutes to which the Chapter owed allegiance,

1 Statutes, p. 102.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 36,

3 Ibid. l.c.

tra

pr

au

its

be

me

SOI

wh

we

tai

tru

qu

Cł

to

me

wh

W

St

fes

the

wi

ag

affe

hav

obl

see

wh

tor

MI

Ble

no

pri

of

to

mi

sta

and, if so, whether it was the Liber Niger of the fourteenth century or Bishop Alnwick's Novum Registrum of the fifteenth, which was the 'immediate point' to which Mr. Bradshaw originally set himself, and to which he devotes a large portion of his work, we shall only deal briefly, as possessing only a local and temporary interest. It is enough to say that, many fiercely prosecuted disputes having arisen between successive Deans, especially the high-handed Dean, John Mackworth, and his Chapter, Bishop William of Alnwick in 1440 2 prepared a new body of statutes, under the name of Novum Registrum, which, when accepted by the Chapter and ratified by the Bishop, was to render obsolete all preceding bodies of statutes. The year before, 1439, at the request of the Chapter, he had produced his famous Laudum, or Award, to settle certain points of dispute between the Dean and the Chapter, on which definite complaints had been laid before him by both parties, which is still in proprio vigore, every Canon on installation undertaking to observe it inviolably.' As to the binding force of this earlier award, which dealt a death blow to the inveterate feud between Dean Mackworth and his Canons, there is, therefore, no question. So little doubt had the late Bishop Wordsworth of the equal authority of Bishop Alnwick's New Register that, soon after his consecration to the see in 1868, he caused the two documents to be printed at his own expense, and placed in the hands of the members of the cathedral body, in order that 'the statutes by which they were believed to be governed, and to have been governed for centuries, might become known beyond the narrow circle of those who had access to the written copies in the possession of the Chapter.'3 Mr. Bradshaw has, however, demonstrated that this Novum Registrum was never formally accepted by the Chapter. The Chapter Acts show that it was the subject of discussion at some forty meetings of the body, and that the Dean having solemnly protested against the new code, and declared that he would never consent to it in any way, the discussion was broken off, May 29, 1442, and never resumed.

'The attempt to carry the statutes, as statutes, through the Chapter having failed, they seem to have been thrown aside, not by any means as a document which had been definitely rejected by vote, but simply as one which had failed to force its way to acceptance.'

The unratified draft, however, crept gradually into a condition of formal recognition. The code was repeatedly

<sup>1</sup> He became Dean in 1412 and died 1451.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> William of Alnwick was consecrated bishop in 1436, and died 1449.

<sup>3</sup> Statutes, p. 214. 4 Ibid. pp. 155-8.

Oct. eenth eenth, w oriion of . local ercely Deans, nd his a new which, p, was e year duced nts of efinite nich is taking f this e feud refore, sworth r that, ed the placed order erned, known to the Brad-

e forty lemnly would ten off, agh the , not by by vote, ance.' 4

istrum

hapter

into a eatedly

ed 1449.

transcribed, and gradually gained strength by the force of prescription. In a sleepy and uncritical age no one had the audacity (even if he felt the curiosity) to raise a question as to its validity.

'However convenient a simple register of customs might have been in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries; however excellent in theory the old English principle and practice of unwritten law . . . men's minds had become habituated to fuller codes, bearing at least some resemblance in form to the statutes of their own day. Hence when all the copies of their Statute Book (copies which themselves went back to what men could look upon as prehistoric times) contained an ordinary-looking body of statutes, such as the Novum Registrum, it was hardly to be expected that any vigorous criticism should be applied to it merely for the purpose of robbing it of its newly acquired prestige.' 1

It need awaken no surprise, therefore, that the Dean and Chapter, when asked by the Cathedral Commission in 1837 to give information as to their statutes, should have briefly mentioned this new register and the *Laudum* as the code by which the Chapter was governed, apparently without so much as giving a glance at the documents themselves. Bishop Wordsworth also 'having received from his predecessors the Statute Book of 1750,' naturally regarded it as what it professed to be, and, in pursuance of his most laudable desire for the revival of cathedral life and activity, printed it as it stood without any critical examination. This may be regarded as a great step onwards.

'To print the book,' writes Mr. Bradshaw, 'was the only way to afford the means of clearing away any misconceptions which might have been formed about it: while it remained practically unknown; and the late Bishop has put everyone concerned under a lasting obligation by the very act which put it in the power of everyone to see and judge for himself, not only of what the book is, but also what it is not.' <sup>2</sup>

We have devoted so much of our space to the introductory and illustrative matter furnished by Mr. Bradshaw and Mr. Wordsworth, that we are compelled to pass over the Black Book itself with the briefest notice. This document, now for the first time printed in its entirety, consists of two principal divisions, 'pars 1ª et 3¹a', separated by a register of certain privileges, compositions, and awards (lauda) selected to serve as precedents, together with the forms of oath administered to members of the Chapter on admission and installation. The first contains the regulations of the church

1 Statutes, p. 192.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. pp. 214-5.

VOL. XXXV.—NO. LXIX.

in

W

ha

the

on

and

COL

COL

ins

we

He

squ

cat

wei

pra

thr

not

who

cou

was

the

clou

sary

the

and

the

rush

Cha

duty

had

nish

keep

by tobla

atte:

by n

for sp

desse

facere

in lo

missi

4

affecting the dignity, privileges, and duties of its members and officials, from the Bishop and Dean down to the glazier and carpenters; the customs observed in the service of the church, and the weekly course, and those relating to the death and burial of a member of the Chapter, and the manner of keeping anniversaries. The third division, to some extent the most interesting, comprises the Consuetudinarium, i.e. the record of the 'rational,' or, in other words, hitherto unwritten, traditional customs of the church relating to divine service, to which so large a portion of each day was devoted, then first reduced to writing, so as to refresh the memory of the elders and to give instruction to the younger members of the body-pro informatione juvenum et memoria senum. The wide range, combined with the greatest minuteness of detail, of the regulations contained in this portion of the document is very striking. It deserves and will reward the careful perusal of all who desire to realize the daily life of a great cathedral. We must content ourselves with indicating two or three points. The duty of hospitality is insisted on as one of the main elements of cathedral life, as 'exercising an elevating influence on subordinates,' and, in Mr. Wordsworth's words, by 'recognizing the importance of companionship makes much of the duty of consideration of inferiors.' There were several common halls or refectories in which the Chapter entertained their officials, in which fires were to be kept burning from the vigil of All Saints to Easter Eve, without any regard to the earliness or lateness of the latter date.2 'The Dean about thirty times a year gave a honorificus pastus in his own house to the choir and the vicars, with the view of making life and work more pleasant to them. One Dean having evaded the rule through frequent absence, it was enacted that he should give the feast whether present or absent.'3 To maintain the spirit of the institution in cultivating personal relations between the members of the body, the rule was that the inviter and the invited should always dine or sup together. Every Canon on his Sunday turn was bound to entertain nineteen of the minor officials 4 at dinner, and daily throughout his week some at luncheon and some at breakfast. It is hardly

Statutes, p. 73. 2 Ibid. p. 365. 3 Ibid. p. 74.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Among the invited guests were included the Chapter clerk, the clerk of the *communa*, and the clerk of 're et ve.' The meaning of this latter term, which had baffled all previous enquirers, has been solved by Mr. Bradshaw. It was the duty of this officer to keep a roll containing notes of every day throughout the year, 'showing when any member of the Chapter went out of commons (Recessit), and when he came in again (Venit)' (ibid. p. 85).

Oct.

bers

azier

f the

the

nner

xtent

e. the i**t**ten.

rvice,

then

f the

of the

wide

of the

very

isal of

edral.

oints.

in ele-

uence

recog-

of the

mmon

their

vigil of

rliness

times

e choir

more

e feast

of the

n the

inviter

Every

ineteen

out his

hardly

the clerk

d by Mr.

ng notes

er of the

in again

in accordance with modern ideas of reverence, though Mr. Wordsworth remarks that, 'like the kiss of peace, it must have seemed but natural in old days' that the invitations to these repasts were ordered to be given in time of divine service, on the part of the canons during the singing of the Te Deum, and on the part of the celebrant at the spreading of the corporal for the offertory at High Mass. The invitation was conveyed by a clerk duly vested. We have also some curious instructions as to the manner in which the invited guest, if he were one of higher dignity, was to proceed to his host's table. He was to be attended by his chaplain, or clerk, and by a squire carrying his drinking-cup and knives, a provision indicating how slenderly the tables even of the higher ecclesiastics were furnished in the thirteenth century. Drinking was not practised during the meal; after it was over there were to be three drinkings of wine and ale—the number is specified, but not the quantity-the order of the beverages depending on whether there was dessert (si habeant species) or not.2 Special courtesies were observed on the leaving of a guest. A Canon was to accompany him to the gate, but the Dean no further than the door of the hall. Wafer cakes (nebulæ, cakes as thin as a cloud) and wine, as well as the napkins, manutergia-so necessary when fingers took the place of forks-were provided by the Treasurer, who had also to pay the wages of the laundress and seamstress (custuraria, conturière) of the Chapter, 4s. to the one, 3s. to the other. It was his duty also to provide rushes or straw to be laid down before the altars and in the Chapter House.3 The Treasurer did not always fulfil his duty to the satisfaction of the Chapter. John Haget, who had held the office for thirty years, was convicted of furnishing bad wine for the use of the chaplains saying Mass, and keeping the good wine to himself, for which he was punished by the stoppage of his share in the Pentecostals, or Whitsun oblations of the faithful, until he gave security for a proper attention to his obligations.4

Extreme care was enjoined for the watching of the church by night, and for ensuring its proper cleanliness. The cathe-

1 Statutes, ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Statutes, p. 286.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 'Species,' Mr. Wordsworth remarks (p. 75, note), 'is used not merely for spices or drugs, but (like the old-fashioned word "cates") to denote dessert, gingerbread, pastry,' &c.

<sup>\*</sup> Ibid. pp. 165, 402. 'Quod temporibus futuris collocaret seu poni faceret unum vas boni vini, puta unam pipam vel hoggeshed in ecclesia in loco antiquitus consueto . . . cum quo capellanis celebrantibus in missis suis ministrari posset et deberet' (ibid.)

I

2

4

CC

th

fa

al

de th

on mi Ai ou tui fol spl fin wh der saf

dral was to be searched twice in winter by the lay sacrist, the watchman, and the candle-lighter-first after curfew, and then after the midnight matins, one going down the middle of the nave and the others 'ex parte anguli,' fourteen candles a week being provided by the treasurer. In summer a single search was deemed sufficient, and that after cursew. The search over, those who chose might lie down to sleep, with the exception of the watchman (vigil), who was bound to watch the whole night through, and sound the hours on a flute (per fistulam), if he knew how and was disposed to do so (si velit et sciat), that the bell-ringers might know when to ring The mention of the bell-ringers leads us to menfor matins. tion the curious provision that on Christmas morning sailors claimed the privilege of pulling the bells 'at prime,' making a point of coming five-and-twenty miles inland for that purpose.1 The church was to be carefully swept daily, but provision was taken to guard that those who passed through the building should not be annoyed by the dust, 'vel aliud inhonestum,' by ordering that the cleaning should take place before the doors were opened in the morning.

These slender gleanings, all that we have space for, will sufficiently indicate what a rich harvest of mediæval customs connected with cathedral life the *Liter Niger* supplies, and will, we trust, lead many to make themselves masters of so

curious and interesting a document.

1 Statutes, pp. 73, 374.

XUM

## Oct.

ist, the w, and ddle of ndles a single The vith the watch a flute do so to ring to mensailors

aking a at purout prough the liud ine place

for, will customs lies, and rs of so

## ART. V.-EARLY CHRONICLES OF THE WESTERN CHURCH.

I. Eusebi Chronicorum Canonum quæ supersunt. Edidit ALFRED SCHOENE. Armeniam versionem Latine factam e libris manuscriptis recensuit H. Petermann: Hieronymi versionem e libris manuscriptis recensuit A. Schoene: Syriam epitomen Latine factam e libro Londinensi recensuit E. Roediger.] (Berlin, 1866.)

2. Monumenta Germaniæ Historica: Auctorum Antiquissimorum Tomus IX. Chronica Minora saec. iv., v., vi., vii. THEODORUS MOMMSEN. Vol. I. fasc. I.

(Berlin, 1891.)

3. Le Liber Pontificalis: Texte, Introduction, et Commentaire. Par l'Abbé L. DUCHESNE. (Paris, 1886-1891.)

4. The Apostolic Fathers: Part I. S. Clement of Rome: (Early Roman Succession, pp. 201-345 of vol. i.) By the late J. B. LIGHTFOOT, Lord Bishop of Durham. (London, 1890.)

IT is characteristic of all primitive attempts at historical composition that they are cast rather in the form of annals than of continuous narrative. The simple co-ordination of facts, and the barest and most jejune statement of them, is all that appears necessary to the first generations of prose writers, and for this the chronicle is the natural vehicle. The appearance of a Livy or a Froissart postulates the existence of a long and perhaps forgotten series of predecessors whose elementary attempts prepared the way for the genesis of history as a civilised nation understands the word. But the rise and development of the literature of Christianity is parallel in many respects to the rise and development of the literature of a people. If it is true on one side that the Christian Church was implanted in the midst of a Gentile world which had just produced an Augustan age, it is also true that it had in the end to work out for itself whole new departments and methods of literature, which, far from springing fully armed into being, followed the natural law of struggle and of growth. In the sphere of historical writing both these aspects of the case find ample illustration. The first Christian history is a book which testifies by its very existence to a period of highly developed civilisation and matured literary gifts, and may safely challenge comparison as an artistic production with

n

W

E

di

m

h

st

ir

b

Se

o tl

V

d

M

H

W

th

SI

fo

Se

po

e: tl

6]

us

aı

d

a

the work of any contemporary Greek writers. But the Acts of the Apostles in this, as in other ways, stands alone. If we except the lost Memoirs of Hegesippus, an interval of more than two centuries elapses between the work of St. Luke and that of the next Christian historian, Eusebius: and the History of Eusebius owes its priceless value as an authority exactly to that quality which ruins its literary merit, the incorporation namely of so many undigested fragments of the ancient writers. And the work even of Eusebius, while it remained for succeeding generations the standard source of information for the period it covered, produced at first no imitators. It was not till the fourth century, with its wonderful outburst of literary activity in Christian circles, had quite passed away, that a succession of writers commencing with Rufinus, the translator and continuator of Eusebius, in the West, and with Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret and Philip of Side in the East, popularised historical writing once for all as a principal department of Christian literature.

On the other hand, chronography, or the writing of chronicles, had long before this found home and welcome in If Bishop Lightfoot's view be accepted,1 the Church. Bruttius 'the chronographer,' who is thrice quoted by John Malalas-in reference to the legend of Danae, to the conquests of Alexander, and to the persecution of Domitianand once (again about Domitian) by the Chronicle of Eusebius, was a Christian; and if so, as the extensive compass of the three references shows, was the first of a long line of successors who included the whole course of history, sacred and profane, from the creation of the world to their own day in one comprehensive survey. There is something magnificent in this conception, and in the unrestrained boldness with which each ancient author treats all lines of development, Jewish or Gentile, as illustrating together God's providence in history: but it must be confessed that few forms of literature are less interesting in detail than the collocation of Egyptian dynasties, Roman kings, Greek poets, and Hebrew prophets, and it is the habit of these Christian chroniclers to devote more space to the mythic periods of history than to those Christian times of which the information they could have given us would have been so rich and so invaluable.

This conciseness for the Christian period we know on the authority of Photius, the omnivorous patriarch of Constanti-

S. Clement of Rome, i. 46-49.

ething bold-

nes of

God's

at few

an the

poets,

ristian

iods of

forma-

ch and

on the

stanti-

ut the nople-and it is almost the only thing we do know-to have characterised the lost Chronographies of Julius Africanus, alone. val of if not the first, at any rate the first great Christian chronicler, of St. which were continued to the fourth year of Elagabalus, A.D. 221, and were a primary authority for the Chronicle of s: and Eusebius from the close of the Hebrew canon down to that as an date.1 A similar combination of prolixity and brevity is a iterary gested marked feature again in the chronicle which may without ven of hesitation be ascribed to Africanus' still more celebrated Roman contemporary, Hippolytus. For the famous seated ns the statue in the Lateran Museum contains mention of χρονικά overed. fourth in the catalogue of writings inscribed upon the chair; and two vity in Latin versions of a Liber generationis mundi are extant—the ession one in the collection of the chronicler of A.D. 354 presently to be described; the other both in independent MSS., and in the or and crates, seventh century collection of the so-called Fredegar-both East. obviously translations of a common Greek original written in incipal the thirteenth year of Alexander Severus, A.D. 235. These versions have been printed, and their Hippolytean origin ing of demonstrated, most lately and most satisfactorily by me in Mommsen in the new volume of the Monumenta Germaniæ Historica, named at the head of this article.2 But since the epted,1 y John work contains nothing relative to Christian history, except e conthe statements that Christ was born anno mundi 5500, and tian suffered at thirty years of age, 'Himself the true Passover,' icle of 206 years before the thirteenth of Alexander Severus, it may comfor our purpose be set aside. It is possible indeed, that (like Africanus) Hippolytus included, among his various catalogues a long istory, of kings and prophets, an episcopal succession of the Roman see, for some of our MSS. supply the title, 'nomina episcotheir

porum Romæ et quis quot annis præfuit.' But the list itself

nowhere follows; though the possibility remains that, if it

existed, it may have served as an authority to some of

the later chroniclers with whom we shall further on have

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 78-138. We should like to call special attention to the note on p. 85, in which Mommsen defends the ascription of the see of Portus to

Hippolytus.

to deal.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Photius, Bibl. xxxiv.; Eusebius, Chron. ad ann. Abr. 1571: 'Huc usque Hebræorum divinæ scripturæ annales temporum continent; ea vero quæ post haec apud eos gesta sunt exhibebimus de libro Macchabæorum et Josephi et Africani scriptis qui deinceps universam historiam usque ad Romana tempora persecuti sunt.' Africanus is named again, ann. Abr. 2234, as authority for the Christian Abgar of Edessa at that date, and ann. Abr. 2237, as influential in the foundation of the city Nicopolis in Palestine, the earlier Emmaus. See below on the Roman and Antiochene episcopal lists, p. 142.

Oct.

1892

enc

as a

with

of .

the

eac

the

exc

des

chr

not

plac

ticu

rup

tha

tha

the

Lig

and

opp

of I

to

Arı

he .

eac

chr

ind

fict

par

wit

eve

hyp

a w

be cur

mis

the and

of

Ros

Most celebrated of all the chronicles which will come under our notice, and for Christian history at large, although not for our own immediate purpose, quite the most important, in spite of the fact that here too three quarters of the bulk is pre-Christian, is the great work of Eusebius, the Χρονικοί Kavóves or Chronicle. Strangely enough, it is not extant in the original Greek, although much of it has been incorporated in the later chronologists who wrote in that language, particularly in the Chronography of the Byzantine writer George Syncellus (c. 800 A.D). But the material preserved to us in Latin, Armenian, and Syriac, and put together for the most part in Schoene's edition, is amply sufficient to ensure us a tolerably faithful representation of Eusebius' general arrangement, and even of his historical notices. Until the present century, indeed, our knowledge of the versions was confined to the translation which Jerome made into Latin, and continued on his own account from A.D. 324, where Eusebius had concluded, to the death of the Emperor Valens in A.D. 378. The manuscript authority for the Hieronymian chronicle is full and early,2 so that we ought not to be often in doubt as to its readings; but since Jerome expressly speaks of himself as having added as well as translated, scholars, who, like the younger Scaliger in his Thesaurus Temporum had to depend (with the exception of the Greek extracts) upon this alone, could never be wholly certain of distinguishing correctly between the contributions of Eusebius and of Jerome. The publication of the Armenian version in 1818 by the Mechitarist Aucher (re-edited for Schoene by Petermann), supplied the required standard for checking the Latin translator; although as the MSS, are late and the version is secondary, for it appears to have come from the Greek through the Syriac, its independent value would have been small. The Syriac itself is represented by two separate epitomes, both apparently abbreviated from a single complete version. Of the one a Latin translation by Roediger is printed in Schoene's edition, but he has ignored the exist-

¹ Syncellus¹ opinion of his author was not sympathetic (Chronogr. p. 670, 2 = Jerome¹s ann. Abr. 2246; Schoene, ii. 178),  $\tau o \tilde{v} \tau o \nu$  (sc. Origen)  $E \tilde{v} \sigma \epsilon' \beta u o \delta$   $\Pi a \mu \phi h v o \delta$   $d \mu \phi d \phi \rho \omega \nu$   $\epsilon \epsilon \theta \epsilon u \delta \omega \omega$   $d \tau \phi$   $\delta v \rho u \sigma \delta \epsilon \theta$ . It is not therefore surprising to find that in cases where authorities diverged, as with the Roman episcopal succession, he puts Eusebius in the second place; cf. his notices of Zephyrinus and Pontianus.

<sup>2</sup> Schoene uses two MSS. of the seventh century, A (Valenciennes, originally of St. Amand) and B (Berne, originally of Fleury near Orleans), besides some fragments. Dr. Mommsen has called attention to a Bodleian MS. not known to Schoene, which is certainly the earliest

(sixth century) and perhaps the best of all.

**XUM** 

ence of the other, though published at Upsala as long ago as A.D. 1850.1

The system of this great chronicle, which commences with the birth of Abraham, appears to be to take the years of Abraham throughout as a framework, and to attach to them in parallel columns the years of the reigning king in each of the dynasties recorded. For the period after Christ these are limited of course to the Roman emperors, with the exception of the Jewish kings and tetrarchs down to the destruction of Jerusalem. In both versions each event chronicled belongs to the year opposite the first line of the notice recording it; but in the Armenian it also frequently happens, especially in the later centuries, that a notice is not placed in the margin at all—that is, not opposite any particular date, but runs more or less across the whole page, interrupting the columns of dates; and arguments have been more than once based upon the supposition that Eusebius implies that he was in these instances devoid of means for fixing the year precisely. Thus it is a cardinal feature of Bishop Lightfoot's discussion of the martyrdoms both of Ignatius and Polycarp, that Eusebius does not really place them opposite the 10th year of Trajan (A.D. 107) and the 7th of M. Aurelius (A.D. 167) respectively, as Jerome would lead us to suppose; but that, as represented by the notices in the Armenian, which interrupt the tables to run across the page, he simply groups all that he knows about the persecutions in each of the two reigns at some convenient point.2 That the chronicler should group homogeneous notices together was indeed an obvious course. But it is, we believe, an entire fiction to suppose that he shrank from ranging opposite a particular year events of which he only really knew the dates within the limits of a reign. The whole work teems, as every chronicle must do, with notices which violate any such hypothetical rule; time after time the 'fame' of an orator or a writer is catalogued under a special year, which can only be supposed to give a rough approximation. In fact, a cursory glance over a few pages will supply the key to the misleading practice of the Armenian MSS.; for it is invariably the longer and more diffuse notices which run across the page, and this is quite obviously done to save space, lest too much of the page should remain blank and wasted.3

Oct.

ome

tant, bulk

vikol it in

ated

riter

rved

r the

sure

neral

the

was atin,

here

lens

nian

often essl**v** 

ated,

urus

reek

n of

bius

on in

the

the

the

have

rate

om-

er is

xist-

nogr.

igen) s not

d, as

cond

nnes,

ans),

to a

rliest

We owe our knowledge of it to Lightfoot's Clement, i. 219. Roediger's epitome is from a British Museum MS., add. 14643.

Ignatius, i. 629, ii. 447.
 It does not, however, follow from this that Bishop Lightfoot is not

N

pr

m

ma

Te

A

suare

be

thi

for

Eu

tha

frig

cer

apa

yea

to

bot

fille

Ro

Eus

with

froi

late

Cor

sele

hist

con my

But

gin

sias

lang

Lat

geno

this

The preface to the *Chronicle* throws no light on the selection of events relating to Church history which are treated of in the body of the work; but the necessary information as to the method and plan pursued is given us elsewhere by the author at the commencement of the *Ecclesiastical History*, which he defines as a narrative at full length of the same subjects which he had already epitomised in his 'Chronological Canons.'

The lines of succession from the Holy Apostles, together with the chronology of the period elapsed between our Saviour's time and our own; the events of ecclesiastical history; the chief personages, whether bishops of important sees, or writers on behalf of Christianity, or heretical innovators, according to the generations in which each lived; the fate of the Jews in the time immediately succeeding their rejection of Christ; the number and dates of the persecutions, with the martyrdoms in each.

Now if we turn to the *Chronicle*, we shall find that on its ecclesiastical side (though of course that is not the only one), the four main divisions of the subject-matter of the History are exactly reproduced: the episcopal successions in the great Apostolic sees of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; the chief actors-prelates, writers, heretics-on the ecclesiastical stage; the history of the Jews during the century from the Crucifixion to the final revolt of Bar Cochba; and the persecutions from Nero to Diocletian. We should have liked to say something on each of these heads; but want of space warns us to confine ourselves, in accordance with the heading of this article, to the affairs of the Western, or, what for Eusebius is almost the same thing, the Roman Church; and it is of course precisely his ignorance in this direction that is the great defect of the Chronicle's The extent of his knowledge is presentation of events. bounded, indeed, rather by language than by geography; there is no lack of mention of facts where Western records are couched in the only language familiar to the East. martyrdoms of Ignatius and Justin at Rome, and those under M. Aurelius in Gaul—the Apology of Justin—the concentration of Gnostic teachers, like Valentinus and Cerdo, at Rome-all these belong to the second century when Greek was still the prevailing language of Western, and especially of Roman, Christianity. But the authority quoted for the

right in asserting that, as a matter of fact, Eusebius had no evidence to warrant him in dating these two martyrdoms to any precise year. Very likely he simply selected a place, perhaps somewhere near the middle of the reign, which was otherwise vacant.

XUM

on the ch are essary ven us Eccle-length in his with the and our

onages,

Christi-

on its y one), History in the h, and cs—on ng the

cs—on ng the of Bar a. We heads; accordof the orance conicle's dge is raphy; records. The cunter centrado, at Greek

for the lence to Very aiddle of

ecially

Novatianist schism in the middle of the third century is the Greek Dionysius of Alexandria; the writings of St. Cyprian, probably even his death, pass wholly unnoticed. If the martyrdom of Pope Fabian is mentioned, nothing is said of martyrdoms so famous as those of Perpetua and Felicitas at Carthage, and of Xystus and Laurence at Rome. Tertullian escapes a similar neglect only in so far as his Apology happened to have been translated (badly enough) into Greek. It may, indeed, be urged that the episcopal successions of the Apostolic see of Rome, continued as they are to Eusebius' own day, when the Roman Church had been thoroughly Latinised, constitute a unique exception to this rule. Yet even here it is a curious phenomenon, that for the dates of the Greek-speaking second-century Popes, Eusebius, our only Greek authority, is far more trustworthy than any of the Western lists; while, on the other hand, the Latin authorities replace Eusebius, who begins to make some frightful blunders, as our safest guides as soon as the third century introduces us to a Latin-speaking Church.1

It was just this defect on the part of Eusebius which—apart from the continuation of the *Chronicle* for another fifty years—Jerome assures us in his preface that he set himself

to rectify.

'You must know,' he writes, 'that I have undertaken the part, both of a translator, and also to some extent of an original writer, inasmuch as, while I have faithfully represented the Greek, I have filled up sometimes what seemed to me to be omissions, especially in Roman history; a department which, as I thought, our author Eusebius (though so learned a scholar was doubtless not unacquainted with it) had passed lightly over, as a Greek writing for Greeks. So from Ninus and Abraham to the capture of Troy I have merely translated from the Greek. From that time down to the twentieth year of Constantine, I have added much material and interwoven much, selected with immense care from Tranquillus and other celebrated historians. From the same year of Constantine down to the sixth consulship of the Emperor Valens [A.D. 378], every word is my own.'

But the additional information incorporated into the original Eusebian matter scarcely turns out, at least for ecclesiastical affairs, to be quite of the importance which Jerome's language suggests. It is derived mainly from the older Latin Church writers, Tertullian and Cyprian. The references to the *Apology* are corrected and enlarged from the

<sup>1</sup> We reserve the consideration of the Papal list, and of the divergence between the Latin and Armenian versions of the *Chronicle* upon this subject, to a later point; see pp. 137, 141.

th

U

m

Fe

ar

tri

fa

wi

a s

ar

on

th

ra

of

wl

pu

H

Fa

de

To

su

tic

ul

sh

ra

re

als

tre

th

th

for

un

Fo

Da

original text, and variant dates for the Nativity and Crucifixion are given from the same writer's Contra Judæos; while under A.D. 207 he is named as 'celebrated in the talk of all the churches.' Of the writings of St. Cyprian are mentioned, besides the Liber de Mortalitate, the collection of eight letters to Cornelius, as well as letters to that Pope's immediate successors, Lucius and Stephen; and the notice of Novatianism is now obviously Cyprianic. 'Novatus, the presbyter of Cyprian, coming to Rome, associates with himself Novatian and other confessors, on the ground that Cornelius had received back to communion penitent apostates.' A third Latin writer whose name is introduced (A.D. 316) is Lactantius, the tutor of Constantine's son Crispus, 'the most eloquent of all his contemporaries, but so poor that he often

lacked the necessaries of life.'

Jerome's independent work for the years A.D. 324 to 378 has in the main naturally followed the framework in which its predecessor was set; we have the same catalogue of wars, famines, earthquakes, and eclipses, of rhetoricians, bishops, and heretics. But the younger chronicler, partly no doubt owing to his vivid interest and personal participation in current controversies, has succeeded in breathing something of real life into the dry bones of his annals; and from a literary point of view the palm must certainly be awarded to the writer whose residences in Rome, Aquileia, and Illyricum, at Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, have all left their mark upon his work. At the same time, this very cosmopolitanism tends to lessen his value for our immediate purpose; for, Western though he was by origin and education, his interests, if we may judge by the events he selects for chronicling, were predominantly Eastern. Of what he does tell us about the West there is not very much that need detain us (we may mention the notice about Arnobius, and the names of the two bishops, Gregory from Spain and Philo from Libya, who are distinguished, together with Lucifer of Cagliari, as having never mixed with 'Arian wickedness'), except, perhaps, the occasional bits of Roman gossip. We hear of Jerome's lady friend Melania and Donatus the grammarian, 'my teacher'; how the Donatists were nicknamed 'montenses' or 'hillmen' by some people in Rome, because their first church

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See for the one under A.D. 35, 108, 173; for the other under B.C. 3. It may be added that Eusebius' year for the Passion, Tiberius xix., A.D. 32, which is guaranteed by the concurrent testimony of Syncellus, the Armenian and the Syriac, is altered by Jerome to Tiberius xviii., A.D. 31.

e most often to 378 nich its wars, ishops, doubt in curing of iterary to the cum, at mark tanism e; for, terests, g, were out the re may the two who are having aps, the 's lady acher'; r 'hillchurch

er B.C. 3. rius xix., syncellus, ius xviii., there was 'in monte'; or how the partisans of Damasus and Ursinus fought for the possession of the Sicininum; or how most of the Roman clergy perjured themselves by accepting Felix when they had sworn to accept no one but the exiled Liberius; while the clergy of Aquileia, on the other hand, are 'accounted like a choir of the blessed.' At the same time it is to be hoped that Jerome's Roman information is more trustworthy than his Roman chronology; for, in spite of the fact that he was cataloguing events which had mostly occurred within his own lifetime, he has scarcely succeeded in getting a single episcopal succession at Rome correct. All of them are antedated, Popes Marcus and Julius by six years, Liberius by four years, and even Damasus, the latest of them all, by one year.<sup>1</sup>

We pass now to a series of less important chronicles of the fourth or early fifth centuries, of which this much, at any rate, may be said in common, that their interest in the history of the first three hundred years of Christianity centres in the persecutions. This, for instance, is the case with the chronicle which Sulpicius Severus, the disciple of St. Martin of Tours, published in the year A.D. 401, and which was edited by Halm in the first volume of the Vienna Corpus of Latin Fathers. Like his predecessors, Sulpicius devotes most of his time to pre-Christian history, and he explains that he declines, from feelings of reverence, to paraphrase the New Testament in the same way as the Old. But while he pursues the true annalistic method in cataloguing the persecutions from one to nine—Eusebius being, it would seem, his ultimate authority, so that he adds nothing new-he foreshadows later developments by becoming at other times rather the historian than the annalist. As is well known, he recapitulates, at the commencement of Christian history, Tacitus' account of the Neronian persecution, and probably also of the destruction of the Temple; at the other end, his treatment of the fourth century is really a history of three things, the residence of the Empress Helena at Jerusalem, the Arian movement, especially in Gaul, and the rise and fortunes of Priscillianism in Gaul and Spain.

But among the smaller Chronicles collected by Mommsen in the volume already referred to, are several which come under the same general head, and merit a passing mention. Four of these rest, it appears ultimately, on the same Roman

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Marcus' accession is placed in 330; Julius in 331; Liberius in 348; Damasus in 365 A.D.

consular list down to the beginning of the fourth century: the Consularia Constantinopolitana (I), the Fasti Vindobonenses priores (2), and posteriores (3), and the so-called Barbarus Scaligeri (4). The first of them adds for the fourth century some ecclesiastical information from Constantinople, and for the early fifth some emanating from Spain; the last has Alexandrian additions and a good deal of apocryphal Gospel history. But for the first three centuries the Christian notices are almost exclusively about the persecutions, and we put together and subjoin those especially that relate to the West.

42.—St. Peter's visit to Rome (2).

57 or 58.-Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul on June 29 (1, 2, 4).

67 or 68.—Disappearance of Nero: 'non comparuit' (1, 2, 4).

95 or 96.—Death of Domitian (1, 3).

112.—Persecution of the Christians (1).

161.—Persecution (1).2

203.-Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas, Carthage, March 7 (2, 3). 250 or 251.—Persecution of the Christians (1, 2, 3).

Martyrdom of Laurence, Aug. 11 (2); of Sixtus and

Laurence, Aug. 6 (3). 258.—Martyrdom of Cyprian, Carthage, Sept. 14 (1, 2, 3). 303.—Persecution (1, 4): the Churches demolished and sacred books (libri dominici) burned (2, 3).

304 or 306.—Persecution in the West (4): Martyrdom of Timothy at Rome, June 22 (2), of Timothy the bishop, at Carthage (4).

The Spanish chronicler, perhaps Hydatius, who continued the Constantinople list, records, under A.D. 399, the destruction of the temples of the Gentiles by Counts Jovian and Gaudentius; A.D. 405, the union made between Catholics and Donatists; A.D. 415, the revelation of St. Stephen, the protomartyr, to Lucian, a priest, as witnessed by the letters of Avitus, a priest of Braga, then staying at Jerusalem. The information of these consular lists is too scanty to be of much real interest; but the same cannot, we think, be said of another of these chronicles of persecution, also published by Mommsen (p. 194). The 'Liber Genealogus,' as the editor

1 The first printed, pp. 205 sqq.; the other three, p. 274 sqq.

1892

call 438 nate add of 1 Hip per he s

it ir and sunt secu

suc

Her Apc eras

fit n

iv n nam in s incli dici ipse

epis pers tion

deb

Satu glor eate huit epis Pau

debe et K xlv.

Mor

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> If this chronicle gives the martyrdom of Polycarp and Pionius, first under this year, and then again under A.D. 167 with the remark in chronico his conss. passos legis, we take this to be a reference not with Dr. Mommsen to some complete chronicle, of which the extant one is an epitome, but to Jerome's version of Eusebius, emphatically the chronicle, which does give A.D. 167.

tury: ienses barus ntury d for t has ospel otices e put West.

Oct.

ie 20 4).

thage,

s and 3).

nothy op, at inued

strucand holics i, the ers of The much id of

s, first ark in e not extant lly the

ed by

editor

calls it—of which the three MSS. give the dates A.D. 427, 438, 463 respectively for their form of the chronicle-emanates from a Donatist source in Africa, and has thus to be added to the scanty and precious remains of the literature of that sect. Like Eusebius and the Liber Generationis of Hippolytus, the writer's interest is mainly in the pre-Christian period; like the consular lists of which we have just spoken, he specially chronicles the persecutions, and his epitome is of such independent value that we do not scruple to reproduce it in full. After placing the Birth of Christ in Augustus xil. and the Crucifixion in Tiberius xvi., he proceeds :-

A passione autem domini usque apostolorum Petri et Pauli anni sunt xxviii : passi Nerone bis et Pisone consulibus [A.D. 57]. persecutio enim prima hæc fuit Neronis quæ iterum futura est sub Henoch et Helia. hic Nero ipse est cuius nomen Johannes in Apocalypsi vocavit DCXVI: hic sapientia vertitur ut conputetur per eras 2 nomen illius qui dicitur

N T I C H R I xvii ix xviii xix xx xviii xix ix iii viii fit numerus collectus asses cliv: hoc quater ducta secundum litteras iv nominis Neronis facit asses dexvi quod est nomen Antichristi. . . . nam et in secretis legimus, de tribu Dan filii Jacob patriarchæ veniet in spiritu Neronis; et Saar est civitas in occidente, ubi adhuc tenetur inclusus, quamvis iam ubique habet metores [sic] de quibus apostolus dicit [1 Jo. ii. 18, 19 quoted].

ab ipso autem Nerone usque ad Domitianum anni sunt xxiv. ipse est Domitianus qui secundus extitit acerrimus Christianorum debellator utpote recidivæ crudelitatis seminarium Neronis et portio, episcopi scilicet Cleti temporibus in urbe residentis.

ab ipso usque ad Traianum anni sunt xviii. neque ipse immodicus

persecutor 3 . . . temporibus episcopi urbis.

a Traiano vero usque ad Gettham anni sunt exiv: cuius persecutione præter quamplurimos passi sunt quos scire potuimus Saturus Saturninus et Revocatus, Felicitas quoque et Bibia Perpetua gloriosas, in urbe Zefurino episcopo præsidente.

ab ipso autem usque ad Decium anni sunt xlvii : minus gravis et eatenus tolerabilis persecutor, Fabiano episcopo in urbe præsidente. huius namque temporibus Ciprianus in Africa ecclesiæ Karthaginis episcopus fuit. sub ipso Decio passi sunt Romæ Sempronius Paulus et Eupater [v. l. eius pater] et in Africa passus est Donus Montanus.

ab ipso usque ad Valerianum anni sunt vii. sacerdotum domini debellator, cuius persecutione passi sunt Romæ Xystus martyrium, et Karthagine Cyprianus, Nemessanus vero Tubunis.

ab ipso autem usque ad Diocletianum et Maximianum anni sunt xlv. ipsi sunt septimi, Christianorum acerrimi persecutores.

3 The name of the Pope is uncertain.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Mommsen, p. 194. 2 eras, i.e. series, numbers.

his coacti Marcellinus urbis et Mensurius Karthaginis, Strathon et Cassianus diaconi urbis, et Cæcilianus dum esset veritatis ecclesiæ diaconus, publice in Capitolio tura et evangelia concremaverunt.

ab ipsis usque ad Stilicone iterum consule anni sunt centum duo, ipso consulatu venit persecutio Christianis vi Kal. Julias, data pridie

Kal. Febr. Ravenna.

Many are the points of interest raised by this little chronicle. We notice first the remarkable persistence of the impression which the belief in Nero's second coming appears to have made upon the chroniclers. The non comparuit of the Consular lists is here worked out into a theory of Apocalyptic interpretation; the letters of the word Antichristus, calculated according to their place in the alphabet (I and I counting, of course, as one), amount to 154, and are multiplied by four for the letters of the word Nero. We thus possess a fresh witness for the Western variant 616 for 666 in Apoc. xiii. 18, which is also the reading of the Donatist Tichonius in his commentary upon the Apocalypse. The connexion of Antichrist with the tribe of Dan, which reappears elsewhere, is doubtless not independent of the omission of that tribe in the catalogue of the 144,000 of Apoc. vii. 5; but though Sulpicius Severus also locates the reappearance of Nero in the West (Dial. ii. 14), we must profess ourselves at a loss in explaining the reference to the city 'Saar.'1

It is curious to find the persecutions divided into the serious and less serious ones, and curious to find, not only Trajan's, but that of Decius also, in the latter category. The account of Domitian is obviously derived from Tertullian's Apology, and that of 'Geta' from the Acts of Perpetua and her companions, martyred 'on the birthday of Geta Cæsar'—both, it will be observed, African authorities. The names of the Decian martyrs are new to us, and this and the following notices illustrate the close connexion which existed, at least from Cyprian's time onwards, between the Churches of Carthage and of Rome. Nemessanus or Nemesianus of Thubunæ was one of those who gave his vote earliest and at greatest length in St. Cyprian's Rebaptism Council, and he is doubtless to be identified with the Bishop Nemesianus, condemned to the mines, with whom St. Cyprian corresponded at the com-

mencement of Valerian's persecution in A.D. 257.

So far we have found no clear trace of Donatist influence, though the interest in Apocalyptic calculations might possibly 1892

sugg secu Don two Stra (afte 'bur charg

Petil Rom tists the h sion in A.l exalt

Chris

A our p (not, from one Ponti and chron the P the F who i beaut cessor this c and s porate Latin are re and th claim obits

1 C contra 25, 26, VOI

Popes

of Pop

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The word occurs in the LXX of Gen. xxv. 9, Exod. vi. 15, as representing the name Zoar. Can it therefore mean Nero's Zoar, or city of refuge?

suggest it; and it is noteworthy that an identical list of per-

secuting Emperors, including 'Geta,' is given by St. Augustine's

thon et ecclesiæ nt. m duo. i pridie

little of the ppears of the alyptic culated ing, of our for fresh ciii. 18, in his Antinere, is in the lpicius e West xplain-

to the of only. The ullian's a and esar'— mes of lowing at least of Carubunæ reatest ubtless ned to e com-

duence, ossibly

r city of

Donatist opponent Petilian. But there is no doubt about the two last notices. Marcellinus of Rome, with his deacons, Strato and Cassian, Mensurius of Carthage, with his deacon (afterwards his successor) Cæcilian, are asserted to have 'burned incense and the gospels' under Diocletian. charge against Cæcilian is the staple resort of Donatist controversialists; that against Marcellinus was made also by Petilian; while the names of Mensurius, as well as of the two Roman deacons, reappear at the Conference between Donatists and Catholics in A.D. 411.1 And we find ourselves in the heart of the Donatist movement when the edict of repression secured through St. Augustine's influence from Honorius in A.D. 405, which the Spanish chronicler above mentioned exalts into 'union' between Catholics and Donatists, is here grimly ranked as the eighth and last persecution 'against the Christians.'

A series of writings, and these more valuable than any for our present subject, now claim our attention, all emanating (not, indeed, officially, but with access to official sources) from historians or annalists of the Church of Rome. Of these, one group is formed by the various recensions of the Liber Pontificalis, of which we shall say something later on; another, and this the earliest, by the material put together by the chronographer of A.D. 354, sometimes called Liberian, from the Pope under whom he wrote, sometimes Philocalian, from the Filocalus who illuminated the original manuscript, and who is familiar to travellers in Rome as the sculptor of the beautifully-carved inscriptions put up by Damasus (the successor of Liberius) in the Catacombs. In its extensive scope this collection covers all history, universal and Roman, sacred and secular. The Liber Generationis of Hippolytus, incorporated, as we have already had occasion to mention, in a Latin dress, supplies the first; the annals of the Roman State are recorded in lists of Emperors and Consuls, of the Prefects and the regions of the city; the annals of the Roman Church claim and receive an equal representation in the small lists of obits or depositiones observed during the year-the one of Popes, the other of martyrs—and more formally in a catalogue of Popes, from St. Peter to Liberius, equipped with elaborate

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cf. Augustine, Contra Litteras Petiliani, ii. 202; De Unico Baptismo contra Petilianum, 27; Breviculus Collationis cum Donatistis, tertii diei, 25, 26, 34, 36. On Marcellinus, see Lightfoot, Clement, i. 293.

details of dates and with some few additional historical notices. If we may follow Dr. Mommsen, the one authority from which all extant transcripts of this collection are ultimately derived was a manuscript which in the sixteenth century was at Luxemburg, passed from thence to Brussels and to Arras, and is last heard of in the possession of the French

scholar Peiresc, who died in A.D. 1637.1

The Depositio Episcoporum contains the names of all the Popes for the century from Lucius to Julius (A.D. 254 to 352), with the exception of Xystus and Marcellus (who, as often happens, has been confused with his predecessor Marcellinus); the day and month, but not the year, of their death, and the cemetery in which each was buried, and where, consequently, the memorial Eucharist was annually celebrated. Marcellinus and Silvester lay in the cemetery of Priscilla, Marcus in that of Balbina, on the Ardeatine Way; Julius, with his predecessor Callistus, on the Aurelian Way; the rest, eight in number, slept together in the great cemetery on the Appian Way, associated since the time of Hippolytus with the name of the same Callistus, probably as its constructor and first superintendent.2 The Depositio Martyrum is a companion list of the martyrs commemorated by the Roman Church, arranged similarly with the days and places of each commemoration. All the names are Roman except the Nativity on December 25, Perpetua and Felicitas, 'of Africa,' on March 7, and on September 14, Cyprian 'of Africa'; and in the last case it is specially added that the Roman celebration is held in the cemetery of Callistus, no doubt because this was the restingplace of Pope Cornelius, who had been translated to Rome on the same day, and who was therefore commemorated, as he still is in the Roman Canon of the Mass, in conjunction with his illustrious African contemporary and ally. of martyrs includes the Popes Callistus, Pontianus, Fabian, and Xystus, and some forty others, of whom Laurence, Hippolytus, Agnes, and Sebastian are the most familiar names; all probably belong to the later persecutions, though dates are only given twice, both times in A.D. 304. Besides this, the translation of the relics of St. Peter and St. Paul to the Catacombs is fixed on June 29, A.D. 258; and we may conjecture that the persecution of Valerian-Pope Xystus died

<sup>1</sup> See Mommsen, l.c. pp. 15-38, and cf. Lightfoot, l.c. p. 246 ff.

1892

espe gest on t

and reck Emp chair of h matt chrothe prese

Christascentemp fuit, [I

quo r illum [H presb et Qu iv Ka

diaco passio comp Nova postq

ordina hoc fa presby Centu [L revers

[=A.I [X sulatu Æmil

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The *Depositio Episcoporum* is printed by Mommsen, p. 70, and Lightfoot, p. 249 (cf., too, Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, p. clvi); the *Depositio Martyrum*, by Mommsen, p. 71; the catalogue of Popes, or 'Liberian list,' by Mommsen, p. 73, and Lightfoot, p. 253.

storical thority re ultith cenels and French

Oct.

all the to 352), s often llinus); and the quently, cellinus in that decessor number, n Way, e of the supern list of rranged oration. nber 25, and on ase it is l in the resting-Rome rated, as junction The list Fabian, ce, Hipnames; gh dates des this, il to the nay con-

off.

and Light
Depositio

Liberian

tus died

in August and St. Cyprian in September of this year—and especially his attack on the churches and cemeteries, suggested the removal of these sacred treasures from their homes on the Vatican and on the Ostian Way to the safer recesses of the Catacombs.

But the Liberian writer, as we have said, preserves another and more elaborate record, in which, under each Pope, are reckoned the years, months, and days of his episcopate, the Emperor or Emperors during whose reign he occupied the chair, and the Consuls of both the commencement and the close of his tenure of office. The estimation of this chronological matter we for the moment postpone; but, besides this, the chronicler adds in a few cases (most frequent in the middle of the third century) historical notices of sufficient value to be presented here in full.<sup>1</sup>

Imperante Tiberio Cæsare passus est dominus noster Jesus Christus, duobus Geminis consulibus [A.D. 29] viii Kal. Apr. et post ascensum eius beatissimus Petrus episcopatum suscepit. ex quo tempore per successionem dispositum, quis episcopus, quot annis præfuit, vel quo imperante.

[Peter] passus autem cum Paulo die iii Kal. Julias consulibus suprascriptis [=A.D. 55] imperante Nerone.

[Pius] sub huius episcopatu frater eius Ermes librum scripsit in quo mandatum continetur, quod ei præcepit angelus cum venit ad illum in habitu pastoris.

[Pontianus] eo tempore Pontianus episcopus et Yppolitus presbyter exules sunt deportati in Sardinia in insula nociva, Severo et Quintiano consulibus [A.D. 235]. in eadem insula discinctus est iv Kal. Oct. et loco eius ordinatus est Antheros xi Kal. Dec.

[Fabian] passus xii Kal. Feb. [A.D. 250]. hic regiones divisit diaconibus et multas fabricas per cimiteria fieri iussit. post passionem eius Moyses et Maximus presbyteri et Nicostratus diaconus comprehensi sunt et in carcerem sunt missi: eo tempore supervenit Novatus ex Africa et separavit Novatianum et quosdam confessores postquam Moyses in carcere defunctus est, qui fuit ibi m. xi, d. xi.

[Cornelius] sub episcopatu eius Novatus extra ecclesiam ordinavit Novatianum in urbe Roma et Nicostratum in Africa. hoc facto confessores, qui se separaverunt a Cornelio, cum Maximo presbytero qui cum Moyse fuit, ad ecclesiam sunt reversi. post hoc Centumcellis expulsi. ibi cum gloria dormicionem accepit.

[Lucius] hic exul fuit et postea nutu Dei incolumis ad ecclesiam reversus est. *dormit*<sup>2</sup> iii Non. Mart. consulibus suprascriptis [=A.D. 255].

[Xystus] passus est viii Id. Aug. et presbyteri præfuerunt a consulatu Tusci et Bassi [A.D. 258] usque in diem xii Kal. Aug. Æmiliano et Basso consulibus [A.D. 259].

1 Mommsen, p. 73.

<sup>2</sup> The words in italics are editorial restorations.

[Marcellinus] quo tempore [A.D. 304] fuit persecutio et cessavit episcopatus, ann. vii, m. vi, d. xxv.

[Julius] hic multas fabricas fecit: basilicam in via Portense miliario iii; basilicam in via Flaminia mil. ii quæ appellatur Valentini: basilicam Juliam quæ est regione vii iuxta forum divi Traiani; basilicam trans Tiberim regione xiii iuxta Calistum; basilicam in via Aurelia mil. iii ad Callistum.

Of these fragmentary but precious records, the notice about Pius and Hermas recalls, of course, the parallel statement in the Muratorian Canon; the information about the Decian persecution and the Novatianist schism, while it agrees admirably with what we learn from St. Cyprian, is independent of him, and adds some new facts. In most of the remaining cases the statement of the Liberian list is our sole authority. The common exile of the bishop Pontianus, and Hippolytus, apparently the celebrated writer of that name, to Sardinia, is the only detail known to us (saving the reference of Firmilian of Cæsarea to the local persecution in Cappadocia) of the momentary outbreak under Maximin the Thracian. more noteworthy is the record of Pontianus' resignation of his office, for this is the only interpretation which can be put on the phrase 'discinctus est,' 1 whether the reason of his action was to end a schism, as some have thought who look upon his fellow-prisoner Hippolytus as occupying the position of an antipope, or the simpler one of relieving the Roman Church from the difficulties of being ruled by a head who was not only in exile, but probably in the mines. 'regions' into which Pope Fabian divided the City among the deacons, must, since the deacons were seven in number, as we learn from Cornelius, 2 be the seven ecclesiastical regions of which we hear in the fourth and fifth century. vacancies in the Roman See, during the persecutions of Valerian and of Diocletian, are nowhere else recorded; but the duration of the second one should apparently be reduced from seven years to three or four. Of the five churches built by Pope Julius towards the middle of the fourth century, the two in the City are S. Maria in Trastevere (soon to be a stronghold of the two antipopes, Felix in 358 and Ursinus in 366 A.D.), and probably the SS. Apostoli: the other three were cemetery churches on the suburban roads, St. Valentinus on the Flaminian road beyond the Milvian bridge, St. Felix on the road to Portus, and that where Julius him-

his b

death

and

conte

1 7

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Lightfoot, p. 286, n. 1: Duchesne, L. P. p. 146, n. 6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In his letter to Fabius of Antioch, preserved in Eus. H. E. vi. 43; cf. Duchesne, p. 148, n. 3.

et ces-

Oct.

ortense Valenraiani; a in via

notice stateut the agrees endent naining hority. olytus, inia, is rmilian of the . Still tion of be put of his o look osition Roman d who The . among umber, regions he two ions of ed; but reduced es built ury, the o be a

E. vi. 43;

Ursinus

er three

Valen-

bridge,

us him-

self was interred near the burial place of his predecessor Callistus.1

Reserving, again, the lost 'Leonine' catalogue of Popes, which has been postulated as the common parent of the Greek and Latin catalogues of the sixth and later centuries, until we treat of the authorities for the Roman episcopal succession as a whole, we pass at once to speak of the Liber Pontificalis. In treating of this celebrated series of Papal biographies there is no need to appeal to any other authorities beyond the sumptuous and monumental edition of the Abbé L. Duchesne, now all but complete, and the brief summary incorporated by Bishop Lightfoot in his chapter on the early Roman succession. The name of each Pope is followed by those of his nation and his father, and by the years, months, and days (as in the Liberian list) of his pontificate; in the earlier part of the series, while it runs parallel with and copies from the Liberian list, the consulships and emperors are added. After this introduction comes an account, brief for the early Popes, and longer as time goes on, of decrees issued on disciplinary or liturgical questions, or of important historical events; from the conversion of Constantine onwards the foundation and endowment of churches forms a new and important section of the biographies. Like the introduction, the conclusion is invariable; the number of ordinations and consecrations performed by each Pope, the time and place of his burial, and the length of the vacancy of the see after his

Such a collection might, of course, have been all compiled at one time; or it might have grown up gradually, being added to from time to time after the death of each Pope; or it might-and this was, beyond doubt, the case with the Liber Pontificalis—have been put into shape now on one, now on the other method. As we have them, the biographies extend into the fifteenth century; but we can claim at once for the first half of the series an origin seven centuries at least earlier, for the manuscripts go back to the end of the seventh and eighth centuries,2 and the notices of Leo II. and Conon between 680 and 690 A.D. must have been the work of a contemporary, for the former speaks of the sixth Œcumenical

p. clxxvi); Lucensis, 490, in the Chapter Library at Lucca, of the end of the eighth century (p. clxiv). [If we understand Duchesne rightly, Dr. Lightfoot must be wrong in calling the Neapolitan MS. a representative of the later edition of the L. P. (pp. 307, 308). It really contains what is called the 'Cononian' abridgment of the original edition.]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The identifications are Duchesne's, pp. 205, 206. <sup>2</sup> Neapolitanus iv. A. 8 is of the end of the seventh century (Duchesne,

cent

late

alon

work

cont

info

less

but o

real

inde

three

mea

were

anno

and

may

Len

nota

of th

find

Em

at o

repla

edic

cenc

and

Stat

obje

prop

and

stan

chur

One

Mar

the !

dow

gene

Late

St. I

of I

with Cost

to sp thes

Council of A.D. 680 as 'lately held in the royal city' and the latter of a legacy of the Pope 'not yet paid.' Moreover, our own Bede, about A.D. 724, was making use of a copy of it for his Chronicle—nay, even of a copy containing information about the Pontificate of the then reigning Pope, Gregory II., so carefully was the Liber being kept up to date, and so constant was the communication between Rome and England.1 But besides this evidence for the period about A.D. 700, the hand of contemporaries can be traced a century and a half further back. Not to dwell on other details accumulated by Duchesne, the biography of Pope Silverius (A.D. 536, 537) resolves itself, even on cursory reading, into the work of two writers, of whom the one looks upon his subject as uncanonically and simoniacally appointed, while he describes with vivid admiration the heroic defence of Rome against the Gothic King Witiges by Belisarius 'pro nomine Romano'; the other. emphasising the heretical tendencies of the Byzantine court, regards Belisarius only as the tyrant who, at Byzantine instigation, deposed the 'beatissimus Silverius' on a charge of treacherous correspondence with the Goths. And we have again the evidence of MSS., for an abbreviated form of the Liber Pontificalis, found in French MSS., and known already to Gregory of Tours, ends with the life of Felix IV., A.D. 530.2

On the other hand, it is not possible to believe that any of the compilation attains a very much earlier date than this. Scattered over the whole corpus of earlier biographies are blunders of more or less atrocity, from the assertion that Pope Gelasius (A.D. 492-496) ruled under the Emperor Zeno, who died a year before his accession to the See, to the assertion that Pope Victor, who died about 198 A.D., discussed the Easter question with Theophilus of Alexandria, who died in A.D. 412. By these convergent arguments we arrive, therefore, at the conclusion that the first half of the fifth century was the period in which a Liber Pontificalis was for the first time published in a complete form; and though it is a vexed question whether the extant form of it-apart, that is to say, from abbreviations-represents the publication even of that date, the question may, from our point of view, be set aside; for it is not a matter of much moment whether histories of the Popes of the first four centuries were written in the sixth

Duchesne, pp. xxxiv, ccxxii.
 For this 'Felician' abbreviation, see Duchesne, p. xlix. 1451, Vat. Reg. 1127 (this MS., like most of Queen Christina's, is French), are sister MSS. containing a collection of canons made in the sixth century, together with this form of the L. P.

Oct. nd the er, our y of it mation ry II., o congland.1 o, the a half ted by , 537) of two anonih vivid Gothic other, court, e instirge of e have

of the lready 0.530.2 at any in this, less are it Pope o, who sertion ed the lied in

thereentury ne first vexed to say, of that aside; ries of

Paris ina's, is in the

e sixth

century or the seventh. Whatever be their exact date, it is too late a one to be a guarantee of truth, and the problem which alone deserves attention is to discover at what point of his work the compiler began to have access to trustworthy and contemporary authorities. Certainly the Liberian list, the information of which our author incorporates with more or less of corruption, takes us well back into the third century; but excepting this it would not be easy to point to much of real value before the episcopate of Silvester. We do not, indeed, forget that these legendary biographies of the first three centuries, worthless as history, have an interest and a meaning of their own, as illustrative of the time when they were written and of its ideas about antiquity; and they are annotated by the Abbé Duchesne with a wealth of erudition and a lucidity of style which leave nothing to be desired. We may mention the notes on predicare (Evaristus, p. 126), on the Lenten Fast (Telesphorus, p. 129), on the subdeacons and notaries (Fabian, p. 148), and on the clerical attendants of the Pope (Lucius, p. 153).

But the historian whose interest lies in the earlier centuries finds his reward in the life of Silvester. The conversion of the Empire and cessation of all danger of persecution was followed at once by an outburst of the builder's skill, aiming partly at replacing the churches injured or destroyed under Diocletian's edict, but partly also intended to express in greater magnificence of structure the Church's thankoffering for restored peace and enhanced prosperity. Nor was the encouragement of the State lacking; if the Pagan Emperor had made it his special object to strike at the worship, the public buildings, and the property of the Church, the first Christian Emperor was willing and able to restore fourfold. During the long empire of Constantine and pontificate of Silvester, no less than ten great churches were built and endowed in and near the capital. One of these, the titulus Equitii or Silvestri—the present San Martino ai Monti, near the Baths of Trajan—was founded by the Pope himself and one of his presbyters; but this was endowed, and the rest both built and endowed, by the zeal and generosity of the Emperor himself. The Constantinian (or Lateran) Basilica, with the baptistry attached; the Basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul, the Sessorian Basilica of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem, within the walls; outside the walls, St. Agnes with its baptistry—presumably the present round church of Sta Costanza—St. Laurence and Saints Marcellinus and Peter; not to speak of churches at Ostia, Albano, Capua, and Naples: all these were built, provided with church furniture, and endowed

with landed property, and it is the list of these donations which our author has most happily preserved in detail.1

To take the Basilica of St. Peter as an illustration, besides the precious materials used in the construction of the confessio for the relics of the apostle and the golden-plated vaulting of the apse, there was a cross of solid gold, an altar of silver-gilt adorned with 400 precious stones, white, green and blue; a golden paten, with a cover of pure gold and a dove upon it,2 similarly adorned with jewels, together with five silver patens; three golden jewelled chalices and twenty silver ones; two golden and five silver ame-apparently flagons for receiving oblations of wine from the faithful. Such were the Eucharistic vessels; but there was also a golden jewelled censer, and a series of ornaments relative to illumination; four brazen candelabra covered with silver medallions of scenes from the Acts of the Apostles,3 and a golden corona—these stood before S. Peter's shrine; thirty-two silver fara or pendants for lights in the nave, and thirty in the aisle. Nor did this equipment mark St. Peter's basilica as singular among the Roman Churches. On the contrary, it was the Lateran basilica which, as both the Episcopal and, in a special sense, the Constantinian Church, possessed alone a multiplicity of altars and a corresponding richness of decoration, special mention being made of the silver figures (bas-reliefs) of the Saviour among the Apostles and the Saviour among the angels. To return to St. Peter's, its imperial endowments were curiously enough situated entirely in the East, in the 'diocese' of the Oriens 4; houses, cottages, shops, baths, gardens, in Antioch itself, with their yearly rents; land near Antioch, near Alexandria, in Egypt, and in the Euphratensis, paying rent sometimes in money, sometimes partly in kinde.g. spices, balsam, oil of nard and papyrus. The total amount of money income was 3,688 solidi yearly. One may suppose that this revenue supported the fabric of the Church and the clergy attached to it; but at any rate it partly, if not, indeed, mainly, was directed 'in servitio luminum,' to provide for the illumination of the sacred building. Lights

Duchesne, Liber Pontif. 170-186.

<sup>2</sup> Such we suppose is the meaning of the words 'patenam auream

cum turrem ex auro purissimo cum columbam' (p. 176).

3 If that may be thought the meaning of the words 'cum sigillis

argenteis actus Apostolorum.'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The inclusion of Egypt and Alexandria in the 'diocese' of Oriens is an incontrovertible testimony (if any were needed) to the antiquity of these lists, for Egypt became a separate 'diocese' before A.D. 386. The Antiochene endowments may possibly have been meant to mark the connexion of St. Peter with Antioch as well as Rome.

nations

besides

nfessio

ting of ver-gilt

olue; a

e upon

silver

r ones;

ons for

ere the

ewelled

i; four

scenes

-these

ara or

. Nor

among

Lateran

l sense,

icity of

special

of the

ing the

wments

in the

baths,

d near

atensis,

kind-

e total

ne may

Church

artly, if

um,' to

Lights

auream

n sigillis Oriens is

iquity of 36. The

nark the

and incense, golden vessels and jewelled altars! well may the nineteenth-century Protestant rub his eyes as he tries to picture to himself what a church was like where the survivors of Diocletian's persecution worshipped.

We have promised to say something before concluding of the episcopal succession of the Roman See, and of the problems raised concerning the order and duration of the various pontificates. The question was one which excited interest almost from the earliest days of the Christian Church. In the great controversy with Gnosticism, side by side with the appeal to the apostolic writings, stood the appeal to the apostolic successions as an 'epistle known and read of all men;' and the Roman Church, tracing its foundation by incontestable evidence to the two apostolic chiefs, St. Peter and St. Paul, was for the whole Church the most forcible, and for the West perhaps the only instance of a genuinely Apostolic See. At least two writers of the second century, both of them Easterns by birth but both conversant through personal visits with the Church of the capital, learnt the Roman list of bishops from the Apostles to their own day as the surest proof that the Church of their own day held and taught the doctrine of the Apostles. Irenæus' catalogue extends from Linus to Eleutherus, in whose time (c. 180 A.D.) he was writing, and is preserved both by Eusebius, and in the Latin translation of the Adversus Hæreses.1 It contains, besides the names of the first twelve Popes, historical notices concerning Linus, Clement, and Telesphorus, but no indications at all of date or length of office. Hegesippus, as we learn from Eusebius, visited Rome under Anicetus, and remained there through the episcopate of Soter until that of Eleutherus; and he must have coincided very nearly with Irenæus alike in the date of his original visit and in that of the production of his work. On settling in Rome, he tells us, he made for himself a 'succession' down to Anicetus; 2 but Eusebius does not go on to quote the catalogue, and his silence would raise a presumption that Hegesippus had not included this in his Memoirs, if it were not, perhaps, enough to suppose that the

<sup>1</sup> Eus. H. E. v. 6; Adv. Hær. iii. 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> διαδοχην ἐποιησάμην μεχρὶς 'Ανικήτου. Savile proposed, and Harnack unhesitatingly accepts, the conjecture διατριβήν ἐποιησάμην, 'I made a stay there till the time of Anicetus.' There is nothing to be said for an alteration which satisfies an anti-episcopal prejudice at the expense of introducing an unhistorical misstatement. [The references for Hegesippus are Eus. H.E., iv. 11, 22; Epiphanius, Hær. xxvii. 6; Lightfoot, pp. 154, 203, 327 sq.]

th

of

01

Is

m

al

W

na

ei

In

to

CC

SE

W

tic

re

Pa

pe

m

Je

33

th

an

fro

Le

contemporary catalogue of Irenæus, brought down to a later point and guaranteed by a more famous writer, may have been incorporated in the *Ecclesiastical History* as a more than sufficient substitute. The question would be one of only academic interest, were it not that Bishop Lightfoot propounds the view that not only did Hegesippus publish his catalogue, but that Epiphanius has actually preserved it to us. It is quite certain that Epiphanius' list ends as Hegesippus did with Anicetus; it is very probable that, as it adopts the name Cletus instead of Anacletus for the second Pope, it is independent of both Irenæus and Eusebius; but it can scarcely be said that its dependence on Hegesippus is as yet more

than a possibility.

A catalogue so well authenticated as that of Irenæus has every appearance of presenting us with the true succession of bishops from the Apostles downwards. And yet it is notorious that many writers have found, as they thought, an irrefragable argument against the apostolic origin of at least the Roman episcopate exactly in the very episcopal lists which profess to connect the later Popes with St. Peter and So diverse and inconsistent, it is said, are the traditions of the earlier names, that the only possible explanation is that Linus and Clement, Cletus and Anacletus, were not successors in the episcopate, but contemporaries in the presbyterate. It is to the consideration of this thesis that Bishop Lightfoot specially devoted himself; and he has, if we may say so, satisfactorily and clearly educed the result that the divergences are all capable of resolution, and that the list which is admittedly the earliest is also the only one which has a claim to be called historical. At first sight, indeed, the variations are bewildering in their extent. While most authorities place St. Clement third, and some even fourth, in the series, he is in the Clementine romance and in Tertullian the immediate successor of St. Peter; and again several fourthcentury writers—the Liberian list and the African fathers Optatus and Augustine—postpone him to Linus, but to Linus only. The remaining name among the first three Popes appears as Anencletus in Irenæus, Eusebius, and the Greek writers; yet no Latin writer, with the exception of St. Augustine, gives this form. A few, including Optatus and perhaps Jerome, give Anacletus, which is no doubt a mere variant, though a curiously persistent one, in the spelling; but the majority of Latin witnesses, among them the Canon of the Mass and all but two of the Papal catalogues of the sixth and following centuries, together with some Syriac authorities and Epiphanius (Hegesippus) among the Greeks, substitute the name Cletus. Finally, there are cases—the Liberian list (with its descendants, the Liber Pontificalis and the Papal portraits in the Basilica of St. Paul) and a Latin poem against Marcion of the fourth or fifth century—in which both Cletus and Anacletus appear.1 Is there not then, it may be asked, sufficient reason to doubt whether any order can result out of so complete a chaos?

The first answer which it is natural to make is that the mere existence of variants is no proof that such differences rest ultimately on different authorities, for lists of names always do produce, and are sure to produce, both omissions, when the eye wanders on too far, and alterations in order, when the omitted name is noted in the margin opposite a name in the text, and reappears in the next copy at hazard either before or after it. We need not go beyond the Papal lists for the period anterior to Constantine to illustrate this. In the middle of the second century Anicetus is placed before Pius by the same Latin authorities who place Clement next to Linus, and before Cletus or Anacletus; and yet no one, of course, hesitates to accept the definite statements of the contemporary writers Irenæus and Hegesippus, made quite separately from their catalogues,2 that Anicetus, not Pius, was the immediate predecessor of Soter. Pontianus is wrongly postponed to Anteros (A.D. 235) by the Greek writer Syncellus and by the 'Felician' form of the Liber Pontificalis with the portraits at St. Paul's; although here the explanation of the error may very likely be that since Pontianus, as we have seen, resigned, and died in exile, his successor, whose reign barely exceeded a month, was certainly buried in the Papal crypt before him, and possibly predeceased him as well. Lastly, the names of the two successive Popes in the Diocletian persecution, Marcellinus and Marcellus, were so similar, that more than half our lists omit one or the other.

Oct.

ater

nave

than

only

pro-

his

o us.

pus

the

it is

cely

nore

has

ssion it is

t, an

least

lists

and

the

sible

etus,

es in

that

if we

t the

list

hich

deed,

most

h, in

Illian

urth-

thers

inus pears ; yet

s this

Ana-

ously

Latin

l but

uries,

lege-

<sup>1</sup> The references are Epist. Clem. ad Jacobum; Tert. Præsc. Hær. 32; Optatus, Schism. Donat. ii. 3; Augustine, Ep. liii. ad Generosum; Jerome, Chronicon, Titus 2 and De Vir. Illustr. 15, cf. Lightfoot, pp. 173, 332. In the De Viris the MSS. are said to be strongest for Anacletus; but in the Chronicle the earlier MSS. all read either Cletus or Clemens, the latter being supported also by the Bodleian MS. 'Clemens' can scarcely be right; but it postulates Cletus rather than Anacletus, and serves to illustrate the facility of confusion between the names Clement and Cletus. The nine Papal catalogues, mostly from MSS. of canons from the sixth to the ninth century, which Duchesne prints, p. 14 sq., are believed to descend from one single list, supposed to have been drawn up at Rome under Pope Leo I., c. 450 A.D., and therefore called the Leonine: Lightfoot, p. 311, Duchesne, p. xiii.

2 Iren. ap. Eus. H. E. v. 24; Heges. ap. Eus. H. E. iv. 22.

We are thus enabled to return to the earlier variations with the conviction that errors of transcription will often account not only for the omission of names but also for their transposition: and this will be especially the case with the names Cletus and Clemens. Moreover, that the duplication of Cletus and Anacletus is a mere makeshift of the Liberian chronographer and his followers, to account for the double form which he found in earlier writers, seems to result from the fact that each name is found separately before they are found together. The position of Clement at the top of the list is still less entitled to respectful consideration, since no one would go either to Tertullian, who gravely informed the world that Marcus Aurelius was no persecutor, or to the Clementine novelist, for sober history. There are, in fact, only two questions to be answered, the order of the second and third Popes, and the co-existence of the two forms of name Cletus and Anencletus. Bishop Lightfoot suggests that the original name was Anencletus, 'the blameless,' Anacletus, of course, a phonetic variant, and that Cletus, or 'called,' was substituted from a feeling of Christian humility for the first or Pagan name. Then, for the other point of the order of the names, so far as the name Cletus was the one in use, the confusion of Cletus and Clement that we have noticed in the MSS. of St. Jerome, coupled with the existence of other transpositions, is a quite sufficient explanation, if the error be an accidental one; but it may also be supposed that it was an intentional reconciliation of the two earlier traditions, the true which placed Clement third, and the false which placed him first, the divergence being compromised, after the manner of compromises, by placing him second.

The conclusion is to be maintained, then, upon a review of the evidence, that the apostolic succession of the Roman See has been faithfully recorded for us by the earliest witnesses; and Bishop Lightfoot's proof of this is a service to the cause of episcopacy second only to his defence of the Ignatian letters. The problem of the *chronology* of the Roman bishops is one both of more difficulty and less importance; and, as we have carefully separated it hitherto from the sister question, so we do not propose now to do more than outline its main bearings. Briefly summarised, the conditions of the question are as follows. From the time of Constantine onwards, the evidence of the Leonine list, the Liber Pontificalis, and other documents, is amply sufficient to warrant not only the length in years of each pontificate, but the day and month of consecra-

tion Pon the . and days Dio

1892

is a less back St. 1 cent the : vers ture

later cypl conf attri and all. diffe

be s is; gene one with Duc Arm Chro the

thro unlil reinf same Chro the . trans

perio exten deriv ends.

besid can v

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, Clement, i. 80.

tion (which was always on Sunday) and of death. From Pontianus to Miltiades (A.D. 230 to 314) the Liberian list and the Depositio Episcoporum give us most of the dates of death, and some of ordination; though, on the other hand, not only the days and months, but even the years are uncertain during the Diocletian persecution. But about the period of Pontianus there is a marked break in the Liberian list, which becomes gradually less and less trustworthy as we ascend further and further back, until ultimately the Popes reckoned downwards from St. Peter overlap by seven years in the middle of the second century those reckoned upwards the other way.1 At about the same era there is a similar break, only of exactly a converse character, in the chronology of Eusebius. It is conjectured, with some probability, that the list he copied for the later period had got so far mutilated or illegible that the cypher of years had sometimes disappeared, sometimes been confused with the cypher of months, with the result that he attributes to Xystus II. eleven years instead of eleven months, and to Eutychian eight (or ten) months without any years at all. But for the second and early third century the case is different. Here the true or approximately true dates must be sought and found, if anywhere, in Eusebius.

Only it must first be settled what the evidence of Eusebius is; for the testimony of our authorities is anything but homogeneous, and the Armenian version of the Chronicle supplies one set of papal dates, while the Latin and the Syriac agree with the History in another. Those who, like Lipsius, Duchesne, and, indeed, all Continental scholars, accept the Armenian as the genuine reproduction of the dates in the Chronicle, are obliged to suppose that two writers, Jerome and the Syriac translator, independently decided to substitute throughout the Chronicle the dates of the History.2 This is unlikely in itself, and there is ample material elsewhere to reinforce the alternative hypothesis that Eusebius used the same chronology in both his works, reproduced for the Chronicle with substantial accuracy in Syriac and Latin, while the Armenian, by whatever methods of intentional revision or transcriptional blunders, has wandered widely from it. Not

<sup>1</sup> Those writers who conceive that the Liberian list drew for this period from Hippolytus are obliged to suppose a process of corruption so extensive as to reduce the Hippolytean material to a *minimum*.

Oct.

tions

often

their

n the

ation

erian

form

e fact

ound

list is

one

world

ntine

ques-

opes,

and

name

se, a

tuted

agan

ames,

on of

S. of

tions,

lental

tional

which

first,

com-

ew of

n See

esses;

use of

etters.

s one

have

we do rings.

re as

dence

docu-

th in

secra-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> It might not be impossible in itself that the Syriac should have been derived direct from the Latin of Jerome; but in fact the Syriac writer ends, not with Jerome in 378, but with Eusebius in 324 A.D., and contains besides no single one of the additions to the Eusebian original which can with certainty be ascribed to Jerome.

only is Jerome's version preserved in much older and better MSS, than the Armenian, but it proves itself, if tested on other points, invariably the more truthful. The proof is clenched by Dr. Hort's reconstruction of a theory first put forward by Harnack, who, in studying the Antiochene chronology, noticed that the dates of all the early bishops of that see (with the one exception, Ignatius-Hero, fixed otherwise by Trajan's persecution) bear a symmetrical relation to those of the bishops of Rome. Accepting as he did the Armenian chronology, Harnack found that the Antiochene accessions were placed at a more or less fixed interval of an Olympiad after the Romans, and attributed consequently to Eusebius the invention of a purely fictitious chronology. Dr. Hort rescued the credit of Eusebius by showing that if Jerome's figures be taken, the Roman and Antiochene dates actually coincide, and it becomes obvious that the historian followed an authority according to which the two lines of succession during this period were simply co-ordinated—the authority probably of Africanus the Syrian.

It is easier to determine thus the chronology of Eusebius than to decide exactly its value. On the one hand Africanus, if it be really he, was certainly an able writer and careful chronologist, as well as a contemporary of some of the Popes whose dates are in question. On the other hand, if he coordinated the Antiochene and Roman episcopates, it may just as well have been because as a Syrian he knew the Antiochene dates best, as vice versa. Such à priori considerations do not in fact carry us very far. It is more to the point to ask what events there are independently dated which can test our Eusebian chronology. We know, for instance, that St. Clement wrote to the Corinthians in 95 or 96 A.D., at the close of the reign of Domitian. We know that St. Polycarp visited Pope Anicetus to discuss the Easter question; and as St. Polycarp's martyrdom falls in February of 155 or 156 A.D., and the journey from Smyrna to Rome cannot well have been undertaken in winter, Anicetus must have been in office not later We know, thirdly, that Callistus was conthan A.D. 155. demned to the mines in Sardinia by Fuscianus, the Præfectus Urbis of the end of the reign of Commodus, and released with the other Christians through the influence of the Empress Marcia when Commodus was still Emperor and Victor was Pope—say between 190 and 192 A.D.1 In the first and last of these cases the result, so far as it goes, is entirely to confirm ai

S

01

01

W

he

fo

re

W

B

he

pe

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cf Iren. ap. Eus. H. E. v. 24; Hippolytus, Hær. ix. 11; Lightfoot, p. 341 sq.

the *data* of Eusebius; while the second case is scarcely inconsistent with them, especially if we select the later of the two possible years, A.D. 156, for the martyrdom of St. Polycarp.

To sum up, it may be said, we think, that the information we have been attempting in this article to piece together from very different sources, fragmentary as it is, is yet not inconsiderable in bulk and not unfruitful in result. Until some one more of the great lacunæ of Christian history is repaired—and the hope must be but a faint one of recovering for instance the Memoirs of Hegesippus—it is only by such slow and toilsome search for side-lights, that fresh illumination can be thrown on the still darkened chambers and obscure recesses of primitive Christianity.

## ART. VI.-FICTION FOR YOUNG PEOPLE.

- The Child and his Book: some Account of the History and Progress of Children's Literature in England. By MRS. E. M. FIELD. (London, 1891.)
- 2. Pensées d'un Homme de Treize Ans. Par Froment de Beaurepaire. (Paris, 1891.)
- 3. Donovan, We Two, &c. By EDNA LYALL. (London, 1889.)
- 4. First Principles for Children. By P. M. (London, 1820.)

To the mind of a healthy child books of fiction are, in a measure, what food is to his body, without which neither the one nor the other can possibly thrive or be in good working order. The first of his mental powers to waken up into active life and demand nourishment is his imagination, by the aid of which he creates a world of his own, with his own heroes and heroines, his own sense of right and wrong, joys, sorrows, mysteries, and belief. Not that it is all dreamland or fiction for him; for though he delights in fairyland, he no less rejoices in solid fact. He would like to know where Robinson Crusoe was buried, how to make the inside of a watch, what gunpowder is, and if the end of the rainbow touches the earth; but no less is he charmed with absolute fiction. He wanders with delight through the enchanted realm of Jack and the Beanstalk, Sindbad the Sailor, the tragedy of Bluebeard; he feasts on stirabout in the giant's castle, or on those dainty cheesecakes of Queen Scheherezade, whose vital charm was pepper. But whichever of these, or a hundred other such

Oct.

etter

other

iched

rd by

h the

ajan's

shops

ology, olaced

r the

e inscued

res be ncide, n au-

luring bably

sebius

canus,

areful

Popes

ne co-

chene lo not

what t our

ement of the

Pope

carp's

d the

t later

s con-

efectus

d with

npress

or was

nd last

onfirm

ghtfoot,

ho

or

F

Be

SC

b:

W

de

wi

suc

exa

tea

It:

T

Tro

Bin

bea

The

Ros

refo

inge

Lor

mise

guai

delicious pages, it be, his faith is boundless. Happiest of mortals, for a time at least, he can believe all he reads, with the one happy proviso that if all is not true it ought to be; nay, is—because his sister Mary says so—and she knows. He reads, he believes, and draws for himself a sound moral, and, if his food be wholesome, a hundred lessons of beauty, grace, and truth, which healthy manhood and riper age will confirm, and the wider experience of life will be slow to take

away from him.

In the volume, therefore, named at the head of this article, The Child and his Book, Mrs. Field opens up a subject of curious and unbroken interest, tracing down the history and progress of children's literature in England, almost from the days of King Alfred to the present time, and giving us by the way a series of picturesque and truthful glimpses of each successive age, to be found in no other single volume. The difficulty of such a task is hardly to be exaggerated when one remembers how many thousands of books, pamphlets, broadsheets, manuscripts, and horn-books must have been carefully sifted to yield bare material; and what patient and skilful care is demanded for search through but a single century. This task she has accomplished with rare success, and left for future investigators and students a complete handbook and treasury of information on topics of extreme interest, about which hitherto little has been known, and that little only to habitués of the British Museum. Our present object, however, is not to take any critical survey of Mrs. Field's book, or to pass judgment on its merits or shortcomings, but simply to give an outline of its general contents for our readers' own guidance, and then pass on to consider the state of children's literature at this day, when the fountains of the great deep are broken up, and the deluge of printed matter is spread far and wide over the land.

Starting with an introductory chapter on books before the Norman Conquest, the dialogues of Ælfric, the days of glosses and translations, we pass rapidly on to the time when French was the spoken language of the upper classes, and English, varying in vocabulary and inflection, was the speech of the Saxon lower orders. Letters were mostly written in Latin, and it was not until 1350 that one John Cornwall, a school-master, began to make his boys render Latin into English. Next came the days of Mandeville's Travels, Wicliffe's Bible, Langland's Piers Plowman, with a few other such books, and education being still almost entirely in the hands of the clergy, a few grammar-schools began to spring up, in addition

XUM

to those of the monastery and the choir, and the great foundations of Eton and Winchester began to be laid. Every page of this period reveals some opening dawn of freshening light and care for the teaching and amusement of the young, whether it be *The Whole Duty of a Child in* 102 *Lines*—

'All manner (of) children, ye listen and lear(n) A lesson of wisdom that is writ here.' . . .

or Master Lydgate's description of 'Master John,' who says:

'I ran into gardyns, applys ther I stal To gather frutys, sparid hegg nor wal, To plukke grapys in other men's vynes Was moor reedy than for to seyn Matynes.'

A Little Treatise on Duty, or Advice to a Wife of Fifteen Years, how to make home happy for her husband, to abolish fleas, or to cook sardines; The Knight of the Tower, or The Nine Follies of Eve; The Romaunt of the Rose, Patient Grisel, or Sir Bevis of Hampton—everywhere, throughout them all, are scattered wise and good words for the young. Tracts, 'balletts,' and chapbooks alike inculcate the old lesson of William of Winton, 'Manners makyth man,' bidding children to grow up in the fear of God, the beauty of truth, chivalry, devotion, loyalty, and love. 'Let us learn' went hand in hand with 'Let us teach our children.'

In a similar way Mrs. Field brings vividly before us each successive epoch, illustrating the salient points with apt examples from the *ipsissima verba* of the different writers and teachers, and so making her picture lifelike and complete. It is thus we have, successively, as it were, photographs of 'The Child in England, 1066 to 1640,' in *Royal Wards, The Training of Girls, The Governess, The Tutor, Twigges and Birches*—of which last, says Tusser, so barbarous were the beatings, that for a mere mistake—

'From Paul's I went, to Eton sent, To learn straightways the Latin phrase, Where stripes fifty-three, given to me At once I had.'

Thence we go on to the palmy days of A B C, Criss-Cross Row, and Horn Books; the gradual spread of educational reform, orthographies, and dictionaries; above all, to a most ingenious and entertaining chapter, entitled 'The Fear of the Lord and the Broomstick,' wherein the child is shown as 'a miserable little sinner full of original sin, surrounded by no guardian angels, but by snares and pitfalls—the devil and all VOL. XXXV.—NO. LXIX.

XUM

st of with be; nows. noral, auty,

e will

take rticle, ect of y and n the us by each The

n one

roadefully
kilful
ntury.
eft for
k and
about
ly to
how-

book, imply i' own dren's deep ad far

re the closses rench nglish, of the Latin, choolinglish. Bible, s, and

of the

dition

F

a

h

al

it

he

sa

pl

tia

of

he

es

to

in

to

th

fin

H

ma

sui

to

dis

and

eve

me

har

off

cric

as

tak

reg

pu

out

the

his works—and, if the rod be spared, in danger of the bottomless pit.' Then follow dreary and distorted pictures of childish conversion, exemplary lives, and joyful deaths; of babies whose eyes were red with sore weeping for sin, and lips full of rebuke against godless parents. Looking Glasses for Babes, Divine Blossoms, and a host of other similarly morbid and unwholesome booklets, became all the rage, in the midst of which, however, came John Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, which, in spite of all its morbid theology, for a long time held a supreme place among children's books—and is still a favourite—next to Robinson Crusoe and The Ugly Duckling.

Of the Nursery Classics that followed, good, bad, and indifferent, from the days of *Goody Two Shoes* down to Miss Yonge's interminable *Daisy Chain* of these latter days, we must leave our readers to read for themselves in Mrs. Field's admirable summary, where they will find all, and more than

all, that is needed.

We turn now to our more immediate subject, the supply of childish literature in this the tenth decade of the nineteenth century; the time, so wise men tell us, of unceasing development, and the natural result of the growth of ages. So rapid, indeed, has been the growth, and so bewildering have been the changes, that we are hardly conscious of their extent. We get as far as tempora mutantur, but are hardly aware how vitally we ourselves have become transmuted, nos et mutamur in illis. And nowhere is the great transmutation more apparent than in the world of the young and the literature expressly provided for them. Passing by the literature of the streets, we have to deal with a larger and more important section of the subject, that which affects the youths and maidens of the class whose parents subscribe to Mudie's or Smith's, who see most of the new books and spend both time and money on shilling novels. It was but a generation ago when the books read by the father and mother of a family were not all deemed as a matter of course exactly suited for the younger people. But all this is now a thing of the past. Boys and girls are apeing to be men and women before they are children. The innocence once supposed to beset and beautify childhood is vanishing, and its ignorance of evil and unacquaintance with vicious things are denounced as mischievous fables. What is good for pater- and mater-familias is equally good for their offspring once out of the nursery. There is scarcely a topic which they are not free to discuss, and about which they do not suppose themselves qualified to have an opinion and to pass judgment. There are no problems

XUM

tom-

ldish abies

s full

Babes,

l and lst of

gress,

e held

still a

nd in-Miss

rs, we

Field's

e than

supply

teenth

velop-

rapid,

e been t. We

re how

utamur

ore aperature

of the

portant hs and

die's or

th time

ion ago

family ited for

he past.

ore they

set and evil and

as mis-

-familias nursery.

discuss,

problems

ling.

in philosophy, science, or religion, into the heart and mystery of which they are not as well suited to penetrate as those older than themselves in years, knowledge, and experience.

'Is Life worth Living?' 'The Origin of Evil,' 'Is there a Future?' 'Protoplasm,' 'Abiogenesis,' and a dozen other such pass-words, are all topics of common talk and idle chatter among candidates for competitive examination. magazines are full of stories and sketches, wherein heroes and heroines meet, encounter, and slay these giants, or are them-Novels are written by men and women of selves slain. ability, for the express purpose of showing, not how far wiser it would be to avoid such perilous enigmas while young, but how well fitted the lovely heroine was to rush into the fight, how gallantly the hero bore himself onward to victory, or how sadly he fell and perished by the way; how madly one plunged into the deep waters of scepticism, or how passionately another devoted himself to the destruction of the Christian faith and to the glorifying of scientific research. of this kind is read by thousands of would-be heroes and heroines; precocious, self-conscious boys and girls, barely escaped from school, who think themselves masters of such topics as have defied the scrutiny of the wisest and keenest intellects of every age. As to the world in which they have to live, and toil, of nothing are they more clearly convinced than of its being a maze of confusion and wrong, unless it be of their own cleverness in discovering the evil. Hence we find actually in print such unwholesome trash as Pensées d'un Homme de Treize Ans, a chattering pessimist who, at the mature age of thirteen, prates to his little world of fellowsufferers in this fashion: 'O that I could but attach myself to anything! But at the bottom of all I see emptiness and disenchantment.' Or, again: 'They speak of the happy repose and the infinite peace of the dead! But who knows whether. even after death, we shall be at rest?' Unluckily for 'Froment de Beaurepaire,' the author of this idle rant, no kindly hand was near to give him a good whipping for his pains, cut off all pen and ink for a twelvemonth, and send him into the cricket-field for three hours per diem of good, steady, fagging as long-stop. 'This,' as Tom Brown says, 'would soon have taken the cheek out of him,' and saved him from being regarded as a hero at his own school, and actually allowed to 'publish at the request of his own friends.'

We may have as yet on this side of the Channel no such outrageous stuff as this; but books abound on all sides of us, the drift of which often is to produce such precocious moral-

izings, and to fill young people's heads with a sense of their own infinite cleverness and importance, and lead them to imagine that to their range of knowledge there is no bar, to their capacity no limit. The one end and aim of life is to pass competitive examinations, in order that one unhappy x, y, or z may obtain more marks than some hundred of other imps not so well crammed. Even school reading-books are beginning to be infested with a similar taint. Every selected extract must contain some special information, facts which will tell in the eyes of the examiner; bits of this science or that, each worth so many marks, but little or nothing chosen as being fit for the mind of a child, nothing to kindle the sense of what is gracious and beautiful and worth remembering for its own sake, greater and better than the child's own thoughts, but rightly the heritage of childhood. Nor is he much better off in much of the fiction specially provided for Instead of that old-fashioned interest in his story which once helped to make a man of him, while all the time he suspected himself to be no more than a boy, he has now before him pretty much the same sort of novelette as that read by his father and mother. It may possibly be slightly boiled down, or diluted, but none the less dealing with the same world of fashion, vice, or crime; the same tone, drift, and teaching, and barren result. Young people, it would seem, must plunge headlong at once into the follies and frauds and falsehoods of the world, and can never too early get a glimpse of that 'seamy side' of life which their elders have learned only by bitter experience.

It is said, on good authority, that about eight hundred novels are published every year in England; most of them within reach of young readers, and mainly depending-for interest—on vicious plots. A vicious plot is where some crime or violation of the moral law is the chief incident of the story, on which the whole turns, and in which the hero or heroine plays a vital part-though it be wrapped in mystery to the end. This central idea may be murder, bigamy, theft, burglary, abduction, embezzlement, or forgery; elopement, ending in the Divorce Court; or a sudden disappearance, ending at the Old Bailey. But, in any case, there must be about it a network of profound mystery; and, sooner or later, a detective who, by his superhuman sagacity, shall at last triumph over all villainy, or with invincible stupidity blunder on to a climax of shameful failure, and leave the riddle unsolved. It would be easy to name fifty such books now afloat, under some such title as Where is He? The Mystery of a Crimson

n

d

fi

W

cl

M

be

in

pa

pr

sti

at

hu

or

their

n to

ir, to

is to

py x,

other

s are

ected

vhich

ce or

nosen

e the

nber-

own

is he

ed for

story

time

s now

that

ghtly

h the

drift,

would

rauds

get a

have

ndred

them

g-for

crime

story,

eroine

ery to

theft,

ement,

rance,

about

detec-

iumph

n to a

solved. under

rimson

Cab, Tootle's Wife, Baby, or Mother-in-law, No. 91, Gone, The Invisible Eye, &c., all much of one mould and plan, tainted with the same intolerable slime of a diseased imagination, and all written for one main object—a swift and profitable sale. A glance at the plots of one or two of these will suffice to show the worthlessness of the whole tribe.

No. 1. Where is She? or Who is He? in fairly good English, chiefly long dialogues after the style of Dumas. Opening scene, a low coffee-house, where cards and gambling are going on, and three men smoking and drinking at midnight. are old friends, the third is a chance acquaintance picked up at the billiard-table. All at once, outside, is heard a sudden and violent scream, at which up start the trio, and, rushing out into the midst of a tempest of snow, not twenty yards away stumble over the body of a man stretched upon the pavement and covered with blood. Finding him to be dead, the two at once take to their heels, leaving the stranger alone with the corpse, from whose dying hand he has taken a piece of paper, bearing on it the one word Elijah, when the police suddenly appear, and the hero is carried off to the station. In due course follows the usual trial, ending with the acquittal of the accused, who thenceforth vows to devote the rest of his life to the pursuit of the real murderer. After being robbed and swindled by his quondam friends, the two cardsharpers, he engages the services of a famous detective X; and, in spite of endless difficulties, the search goes on for months, or years (during which the reader is introduced to almost every known phase of rascality), and then utterly breaks down. Renewed with double vigour by the trio, now firm friends, the search is continued; some notable scoundrel is hunted down and at last brought to bay, but found to be the wrong man. Detective X had, after all, been right in his choice of a villain, but, becoming lost in a fog of mystery, suffered him to escape, and then cut his own throat in despair. Mr. Sykes disappears among the slums of New York, and the benighted trio betake themselves to Monte Carlo, where by an infallible 'Martingale' (found written on the back of the Elijah paper!) they break the bank and escape by the midnight express to Paris, where Nemesis overtakes them among a set of still greater scoundrels than themselves.

From the first page to the last of this unsavoury trash there is no one character or incident to which the reader is attracted by its freshness, truth, or beauty; no spark of humour or real pathos to enliven the dull record of roguery, or kindle one noble thought. What little power the writer

a

p

S

Si

0

tl

SI

b

as

ai

may possess is spent in the fruitless pursuit of an unknown assassin, through a maze of cunning, profligacy, and crime worthy of the *Newgate Calendar*. And yet with slight variations, no other and no better is the groundwork of a host of recent novels, which are devoured by thousands of eager readers, whose vitiated taste at last can relish no purer diet.

No matter what the title, behind it lurks the same inevitable cloud of nauseous evil, the tainted air of crime, of mad passion, and senseless extravagance. If it be No. 91, ninetyone is the number of the house or the room where the assassin or forger once lived, or the dead body is found. If it be Tootle's Wife, then is Tootle the seductive scoundrel who, with a wife still alive at Madras, comes home on leave, and wins the heart of a rich heiress at Brighton; while she, in revenge of a brutal husband, becomes the slave of some other villain, to be watched by a detective, and finally landed in the Divorce Court. The Invisible Eye belongs to that famous toxicologist who, through a keyhole, watched the secret poisoner at his fiendish work, and prepared for him the hangman's rope; while The Mystery of the Crimson Cab springs from the delicious fact that a certain notorious murderer once employed a vehicle of that colour for the secret despatch of his victims. Gone! simply typifies the sudden disappearance of a banker in Cheapside at noon-day, and his reappearance first as croupier in a Parisian gambling hell, and finally as a missionary in Timbuctoo. No plot can be too widely extravagant, no hero too worthless, no incident too outrageously improbable, for the purposes of the paltry artist in crime, or the greedy palate of his customers.

But we have now to deal with a class of fiction of a different and higher order, though, in one way, almost as unprofitable to young readers as the classics of crime. The authors, in this case, are men and women of known ability, some of them masters of a good style, not without taste and Abjuring the records of Mr. Sykes and Baron Munchausen, they plunge headlong into the problems and mysteries of human existence, the wild despairs that seem to be eating out the life of Christian belief in many a brave heart. No matter where the scene, or what the date, of the story, sooner or later comes the inevitable burden, Is life worth living? Is there any future after the dream? &c. It may occur anywhere; in the wilds of the desert, or in the ballroom; a lonely village or a crowded city, at college, or even at school. Happen where it may, the knotty problem must be discussed and solved by hero or heroine as glibly and

own

ime

ria-

t of

ager

evit-

nad

ety-

ssin

tle's

wife

eart

rutal

be ourt.

who.

dish

The

fact

le of

one!

er in

upier

ry in

hero

e, for

reedy

a dif-

The

oility, e and

Baron

and

em to

heart.

story,

balleven

must

y and

et.

easily as the laws of tennis, the last murder, or the price of sugar. With no preliminary study, and without any sufficient knowledge of the subject, the author, if only enthusiastic and earnest enough, feels competent to grapple without peril with the deepest problems of human life, and the subtlest mysteries of our existence. The result is a simple fiasco, or utter shipwreck.

In proof of this, it is only necessary to turn to the pages of a few well-known and popular romances, of high repute at Mudie's, and quote the plot and words verbatim. No. 1 opens at an ostrich farm in the Transvaal, where, at the house of their uncle, a burly old settler, the lovely heroine and her sister have, 'after a couple of years' schooling at the Cape,' grown up as lonely flowers of the desert, ignorant, alike, of the world, its fashions, sins, and follies.

'I have never seen,' says Bessie, 'anything or anybody. I am nothing but an ignorant, half educated farmer girl, with nothing to recommend me but my looks.'

The story being one of adventure, it is only natural at p. 3 to find the heroine in peril of a bloody death, that of being kicked to death by a mighty cock ostrich; and hardly necessary to add that she is only saved by the sudden appearance of the hero (who barely escapes with his own life), and that the two ride off together to the farm. So gallant, so handsome, is the stranger, that in chap. vi. both the sisters are in love with him, and then it is that the elder girl opens her heart to him, as they sit lovingly conversing in the hollow of a wild rocky gorge, with 'thousands of white arum lilies growing on all sides of them in full bloom.' In his rambles he had come upon her (as heroes will ever do) suddenly, as she lay sleeping among the grass and flowers, and then waking from a dream.

'Do you know,' says he, 'you are a very odd person; I don't

think you can have a happy mind?'

'A happy mind?' replies this unsophisticated little flower of the wilderness, 'a happy mind? Who can have a happy mind? Nobody who can feel. Supposing,' she went on after a pause, 'one puts one's own self, interests, joys, and sorrows quite away, how is it possible to be happy, with the breath of human misery beating against one's face, and the great tide of sorrows and suffering creeping up to one's feet?' (This poor little innocent who had never seen anything or anybody!) 'I may be wrong; but I don't see how anybody who feels can be happy in such a world of sickness, suffering, slaughter, and death. But, there, Captain, my ideas are very crude, and I daresay wrong, but what is the use—what is the use

of anything? The same old thought passing through the same human minds from year to year, from century to century [sic], clouds born in the sky, and the thoughts born in the brain, and both end in tears, and re-arise in blinding, bewildering mist, and this is the beginning and the end of thoughts and clouds. They arise out of the blue, they overshadow and break into storms and tears, and then they are drawn up into the blue again, and the whole thing begins afresh.'

Surely such idle rant as this is totally unnatural in the mouth of such a poor, innocent, maiden as is here described. Brought up in the wild of a beautiful desert, remote from the follies and vices of the world, man, and all his evil ways, she falls into the hysterical rant of a worn-out roue, who having tasted of all forbidden pleasures finds at last that the apples of Sodom are but ashes in the mouth. Still more ludicrous does the whole thing become, when the author fondly goes on to invoke the aid of another witness in the column of boulders above her head, which seemed to say:

'I am very old, I have seen many springs and many winters; I have looked down on many sleeping maids, but where are they now? All dead, all dead! And an old baboon' (who ought to have known better) 'in the rocks above barked out "All dead!" in answer.'

How unnatural all this is, and how utterly out of place in the mouth of such a guileless maiden, and in such a story, is at once apparent from the one fact that, after some hundreds of pages of wild and bloody adventure, fierce love-making, and passionate jealousy, this same gentle and delicate heroine having vainly endeavoured to instigate an aged Caffre to foul and deliberate murder, finally perpetrates it with her own dainty hands! If this was the kind of heroine that the author meant to draw, far better to have left out all the poor stuff about arum lilies and the old baboon, and reserved his sermon about

'Thinking itself is but a waste of thought, And nought is everything, and everything is nought,'

to a future occasion.

No. 2 is a romance of a still fiercer and more fiery order, the plot tangled, and the issue utter shipwreck both to hero and heroine. The first chapter, where the lovers meet to plight their vows under the full splendour of a radiant moon, is as simply tremendous as the opening scene in a Surrey pantomime. The ruined abbey, the lonely fens, dim sounds from distant lagoons, the still, enchanted night, the heroine clad in black on horseback, herself fair as marble, of exquisite

also piero other they to the joys plung

1892

walkin lived and w with r Roofle soon 1

the be now'

B now i bimse clares chapt vows, even away, incide affairs Mont noble: furthe which atheis heroir findin have of sha crime,

ture o

new re

Of

ame

uds

end

the

t of

hen

gins

the

ped.

the

she

ing

sof

loes

n to

lers

; I

S wo

own

e in

ory,

un-

ove-

cate

ffre

her

the

oor

his

der,

nero

t to

oon,

rrey

inds

oine

isite

beauty, warm, passionate, sweet! Suddenly enters the hero, also on horseback, also in sable garments, with black hair, piercing eyes, &c. They dismount, and spring into each other's arms, converse, gazing up at the starry heavens as they talk, in the approved fashion of enraptured lovers! Yet, to these hapless mortals not five minutes pass before all the joys of love are forgotten, and suddenly once more are we plunged into the old misery of miseries!

'Yes, dearest, men perish—generations come and go; we are walking on the tombs of those who lived and loved as we do. They lived when belief was so easy. It was enough then to close the eyes and walk blindly on in assurance of a Saviour. Now we must stare with naked eyes at the skeleton of what was once a living truth.... Roofless, deserted, naked to heaven stands the Church of Christ, soon to perish and leave not a trace,' &c. (p. 6).

'Perhaps,' goes on the lovely heroine, 'God hid Himself away in the beginning, and it is not His will that we should comprehend Him

now' (p. 7).

'Then, why plant in our souls such a cruel longing?' &c.

But, you do believe in God and in our Saviour? 'Not in the letter, dearest; in the spirit, certainly.'

Being an ordained priest of the English Church, the hero now finds such views to be in defiance of his orders, regards himself as a persecuted, degraded, and ruined man, and declares that they must part. To this she will never agree, and chapter i. ends with vows of unalterable fidelity. To these vows, however, the reverend gentleman makes no reply, not even a word of one other potent reason 'why he should go away,' viz. that he was already a married man! This favourite incident, however, in modern romance does not transpire until affairs have become a good deal more complicated, when Mrs. Montmorency duly appears as the kept mistress of a wealthy nobleman, 'who is awfully rich, and very good to her.' Any further there is no need to unravel this unsavoury plot, which, having run its due course of mystification, rhapsody, atheism, and guilty passion, ends dismally enough with the heroine's death in a Romish nunnery, and the hero's at last finding rest in the grave-yard at Ammergau. Whatever may have been the author's aim in writing this intolerable farrago of sham, sentimental, dreaming, spiritualistic roguery and crime, matters little. The result is simply a shameless caricature of Christian belief, and an utter exposure of the so-called new religion of Christian morals without Christ, and of worship without any personal God.

Of the utter worthlessness of such a book as this, from a

literary point of view, there can be no possible doubt; while it would be hard to find anything more certain to poison and deprave the taste of the young reader. What one human being can be the better for reading it? Does it rouse one single noble passion, lighten any burden, soothe any sorrow, clear up any doubt, calm any mental strife, hold up to view any one example of man or woman worthy of admiration. love, or pity? From p. i. to finis it is a mere glaring picture of ignoble and unmanly passion, treachery, and criminal selfindulgence, painted in colours at once tawdry and untrue to life. And yet, if we are to believe one of the most facile and popular of such authors, the whole question is simply one of supply and demand. The publisher, we are told, orders such and such a book, staid or sentimental, sceptical or orthodox, just according to the prevailing fashion or craze, and the writer of fiction obeys. He is told not to tread too hard on the favourite corns of the public; the thing must be cunningly wrought, amusing-bloody, if you like-sensational, and exciting: to go with the age, and follow the popular demand. He might, of course, do otherwise and better, but he would find no readers, and so the thing would not pay. If the matter stands really thus (and the author speaks after considerable experience in the manufacture of such books), no wonder that volume after volume of poisonous trash appears, and is devoured by thousands of hungry readers with an appetite that grows coarser by what it feeds on. Fresh examples of this worthless stuff might easily be cited; but we must pass on to a class of a far higher order, where the voice of despair is still heard, but without any flavour of the Divorce Court or Scotland Yard. The writers are persons of taste, ability, and moral tone, whose aim is not to destroy the belief in a future life, but to build it up, if built up it may be, before ruin overtakes it, though totally unprepared by previous study or knowledge for any such arduous task. Possessed of the one gift of ready writing they dash headlong into the fray, ready at all hazards to show the supposed weak points of a fortress they have never explored, and to defend it with armour not fully proved, as if mere enthusiasm could atone for want of skill in the choice of weapons, and frantic ardour for ignorance of the art of war.

As an example, take A Romance of Every-day Life. At p. 2 the hero, in a public reading-room, takes up a number of the W. Review. He is a young and clever undergraduate (about to take holy orders), and, deeply in earnest, reads an article on the evidences of Christ's resurrection, which at once makes utter

ships viction

has t

viction bene a not hero ushe again once set defendance

whole wiser respector for the simple better ing read

popu

tone

fiery more under as he unquis we an in Chri of p one befo slow of cr

high in the conjoyf

of k

1892

while on and human se one sorrow, o view iration.

picture al selftrue to ile and one of rs such

hodox. nd the ard on ningly il, and

emand. would If the er conks), no

ppears, rith an Fresh but we e voice Divorce

f taste, e belief before s study of the he fray,

its of a it with d atone ardour

fe. At mber of (about ticle on es utter

shipwreck of his faith as a Christian. All his old religious convictions are upset, and he rushes home in despair. But he has to earn his bread as a teacher, and must swallow his convictions, so that the battle has to be carried on-for his benefit and partly in his presence—between a clergyman and a notorious atheist. So well is this done that for a time our hero's doubts are all but quieted; but, having become an usher in a school, he is soon plunged headlong into the fray again. Three or four of the upper boys are agnostics, and at once assail him. The old arguments of Huxley & Co. are set out in battle array, and he, half in defiance, half in defence, is driven to upset their shallow sophistries, and the whole thing degenerates into farce. His next step-a far wiser one—is to marry his master's daughter, become a quiet, respectable citizen, and promise to do what he can to believe for the future. But cui bono the battle of atheism? Finis simply leaves things where they were at p. 2, Christianity no better, unbelief no worse, but the seeds of doubt and sneering scepticism sown in the minds of thousands of young readers by the flippant chatter of a set of ignorant schoolboys.

Even if we turn to two other well-known and deservedly popular stories, by an author of far higher ability and loftier tone, we again enter on dangerous ground. The young and fiery hero who carries on the battle of unbelief seems to have more or less the best of it all the way through, and, after undergoing many sorrows and much bitter persecution, dies, as he had lived, an avowed atheist, in spite of all the author's unquestioned zeal for the Christian faith. The whole story is well meant and well told, full of high, moral, tone, and yet an impression left on the young reader's mind is, not that the Christian Creed stands firm and secure, but open to a score of plausible objections before unknown to him, and which no one in We Two at least is able to refute. Thus a thing never before doubted, by merely being made food for speculation, slowly becomes questionable, and at last is counted unworthy of credit, just as a sudden panic will cause a run upon a bank of known stability, and give it a doubtful name. Hence

> 'He learns to doubt who doubted not before, And they who always doubted doubt the more.'

The second story, marked by the same ability, the same high, moral, tone and earnest feeling, differs from the other in that the hero, instead of dying in impenitence, is happily converted in the final chapter, and the scene closes amid the joyful clamour of wedding bells. Up to a given page he is

hard as the nether millstone, but, after a wild course of dissipation and defiance, is arrested and saved. As we objected to the sudden shipwreck of faith in a former case, so here we object to the sudden conversion by a single dialogue. story is full of bright, amusing, natural incident from first to last, but the hero's wild outcries of despair, hysterical outbursts of passionate mockery of the existence of God, and swift conversion appear unreal. No such fatal disease can befall such a man as suddenly as an attack of measles or mental nettle-rash, nor be flung off by one dose of patent

The noble and generous Donovan has much to bear at the hands of his Christian adversaries, and he bears it all with heroic patience, and it may be quite true that kindness is the argument most likely to convert the avowed atheist. and charity the mightiest armour to be worn in defence of the faith; but it is hardly fair that the young reader's sympathy should go, not with the Christian people who have to put up with him, but with the very improper person who is creating all the disturbance. The drama becomes unreal, the giant of unbelief a mere monster stuffed with straw, while the stronghold of Christian belief seems easily assailed by a host of deadly weapons of keen edge and easily found, a result totally opposite to the wish and intent of the author, whose

works in other respects deserve our warmest praise.

Passing from volumes of this high caste, we come to a more abundant, sentimental, and inferior class, full of silly talk found nowhere but in books, yet highly seasoned with sensational adventure, of which two examples must suffice as types. First comes Nobody's Child, in which Adrift, the hero, of unknown parentage, is suddenly deserted by a troop of gipsies, and left to die as an outcast. Totally ignorant and uneducated, hardly knowing the name of God, his delight is nevertheless 'to camp out in the sweet summer air, and dream beneath the stars, his only sound of joy being the chirp of the grasshopper and the song of the nightingale, &c. &c. But having become for a time the slave of a brutal monster of a blacksmith, and his two equally brutal apprentices, and mastered their craft apparently without teaching, he suddenly emerges as a chivalrous hero of romance, in daring, skill, and knowledge more than a match for all comers. Then follows a string of perilous adventures, hairbreadth escapes, and midnight rescues of imprisoned women and babes, in which Adrift, still a mere child, plans, resolves, speaks, and acts as a full-grown man, finally mingling in

scen the 1 simp and possi again as T

1892

takes cocio villa e.g. a and chat no li is in she v proc rescu hoste laug dogs final

soun

pray

coule

child

I what whos ripe: of R Hist map Hist Plate soar This teen. toil a her v

coun

had

devo

bette

scenes of bloody strife, carnage, and plunder such as followed the French Revolution. To a child the whole plot will seem simply incredible—at times too silly for a nursery tableau, and anon too outrageous for a Surrey pantomime. It may possibly be read once, if nothing else can be had, but never the belief of the second strip to be seed at

again looked at.

Still more unreal, morbid, and mischievous are such things as The Maiden of Mildmay, who, at the mature age of seven, takes upon her the rôle of a sweetly sentimental and precocious Good Samaritan and Lady Bountiful in a country village. Her talk is a strange lingo made up of silly babble e.g. dreffl instead of dreadful, and zackly for exactly, ou for you, and dood for good, &c., mixed with the high-flown, sentimental chatter of a pert lady's maid; and her whole life glides away as no living child's ever did. If a naughty boy goes poaching, and is in danger of being transported for life for the offence, it is she who beards the furious old ogre of a squire in his den, and procures a pardon; she reads to the sick and dying villagers; rescues a drowning kitten from savage boys; plays the part of hostess at the rectory; discusses the question of excessive laughter with reference to growing fat; the disposition of dogs; and the worthlessness of mere good looks; and finally converts a worn out, jaded, woman of fashion to sounder views, a belief in guardian angels, and the efficacy of prayer! In short, she behaves in a way that no child ever could or did, and talks in a fashion from which every healthy child would turn away as sickly twaddle.

But if childish fiction of this kind serves no useful purpose, what shall be said of a really authentic unhappy little mortal whose Diaries, Reflections, and Journals inform us how, at the ripe age of eight, she began authorship with a Natural History of Reptiles, Birds, and Quadrupeds; at twelve completed a History of the Jews, introduction, index, illustrations, and a map! next, a History of Greece and Rome; an imaginary History of England from 1840 to 2354 (sic); flew back to a Platonic dialogue with the shade of Herodotus, and then soared aloft in a couple of epics, Witikind and Cosmurania! This sad list is still further increased up to the age of seventeen, when the poor child is by death released from all earthly toil and pain, and her weary brain is at rest. Far better for her would it have been if, at the age of ten, instead of taking count of the vast number of public-houses in one village, she had been playing at hide and seek, working a sampler, or devouring Blue Beard. What reader-old or young-is the better for knowing that such a precocious little chit thinks

se can sles or patent ear at it all ndness

theist,

Oct.

dissi-

pjected

ere we

first to

al out-

d, and

The

nce of s symave to who is eal, the ile the a host result whose

e to a f silly d with fice as e hero, oop of nt and ight is r, and ng the ngale,' brutal

oprenching, nce, in omers. readth n and solves,

ng in

to wh

taugh

full of

then

then

Ouite

the sa

which

you v

dog

thanl

Devi

you a

Whe

use c

gran

garde

Eve ?

Eve a

die to

Wha

word

such

&c. in wl

the 'paintings on the dome of St. Paul's are very ill done.' that West's pictures are cold and tame, that she is pleased with the Thames, or displeased with the Monument? But it is one of the crazes of the present age to search for, bring to light, and glorify infant prodigies of all kinds-authors. musicians, or critics of fifteen, who, like E. S., presume to take Walter Scott to task for 'antedating the introduction of silk into England,' 1 to 'approve of Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar,' or the 'style of Herodotus,' or, to pooh-pooh Virgil. Such books, and such unchildlike children, are said to be nourishing food for the rising generation, and 'precious by way of example,' and thus it is that we come at last to such lamentable nonsense as The Life of a Baby, being 'a strictly authentic history,' with the head of a smirking child facing the title. This amazing infant, when just able to crawl, didn't like toys, but loved to sit in a rocking chair, and 'sing Jesus, Jesus,' crying out 'No, no,' at the sound of any other song. When a year old she would lie in her cot 'with clasped hands while her father read the Bible,' and, though unable to say many words (a year old!), if her parents came in to breakfast without saying their prayers, &c., she would put out her hand and cry 'No, no,' looking wistfully at the Bible on the shelf. When her father prayed she would kneel and pray at a chair by herself, and if left alone spent the time in prayer! Never weary at church (two years old) or at Sunday school, she knelt with clasped hands. At the sound of naughty words in her father's shop, she would run up and cry out 'Ah! naughty man, shut door,' while among friends, relations, and companions, she acted as a perpetual religious scarecrow. When sick she only enjoyed the nauseous draughts of Dr. Bolus, removed a fourth blister with her own hands, and, death being near, was still able to reprove her father for not coming up to prayers! 'Nothing,' says the Preface, 'has been added to the simple truth of this infant's angelic life,' and any incredulous reader is impudently rebuked with 'they speak that they do know, and testify that they have seen.' No such child ever really lived-but supposing that anything at all resembling such a hapless abortion ever drew breath, it must have been by unceasing mismanagement forced into a diseased state of mind and body, for which death was the only remedy. Such details are simply nauseous, as unreal and mischievously false as the sickly trash in a Child's Manual, the one aim of which is to impress on the minds of children their supreme love for wickedness of every kind, and their fitness for Hell 1 Lord of the Isles.

ludic and said,

I book the exist with when Cina univ inter

gods

depi

Livi

a fre

done.'

oleased

But it

ring to

uthors, to take

of silk

Cæsar!

ourish-

way of

entable

thentic

e title.

e toys,

Jesus,' When

s while

vithout

und cry When

hair by Never

ol, she

ords in

aughty

com-

When

Bolus,

n being

g up to

l to the

dulous

hey do

d ever

mbling

e been

tate of

vously

aim of

preme

or Hell

Such

Such

to which they are infallibly doomed. Thus, little Lucy is taught to say, 'My heart is so exceedingly wicked, so vile, so full of sin, that even when I appear to be tolerably good, even then I am sinning; when praying, or reading the Bible, even then I sin. When I speak I sin, and I sin when I am silent.' Ouite on a par with this intolerable stuff is another book of the same genus, where we find a dialogue entitled The Soul, which begins thus: 'Have you feathers on your skin? Have you wings? Is your mouth like a chicken's beak? Can a dog thank God? No; dogs and horses and cows cannot thank God,' &c. Next, under Wicked Angels, we have, 'The Devil hopes very much you will come and live with him when you die.' 'When you say, I don't care, you are like the Devil. When you think yourself good, you are proud like the Devil,' &c. Still more intolerable—if it be possible—is the fashion in which the words of Scripture itself are travestied for the use of these little ones 'doomed to perdition,' and the simple grandeur of the sacred text turned into worthless twaddle.

'Are you not sorry that Adam and Eve were turned out of the garden? Adam was forced to dig till he was hot and tired, &c. Eve was often sick! God had said a long while before, Adam and Eve and all their children must go to Hell unless you (i.e. the Saviour) die to save them,' &c.

What, again, can be more false in tone or taste than such words as 'Mary thought she was not good enough to have such a baby. . . . She called her baby her Saviour, for *she knew that He would save her from Hell!*' Or more offensively ludicrous than these at the grave of Lazarus: 'It was a hole, and a very large stone was before the hole. . . . Then Jesus said, "Undo the clothes!"'

It is not, of course, for a moment pretended that such books as these from which we have quoted form, or represent, the great bulk of our children's literature, but their bare existence is a monstrous evil, and well justifies the regret with which Mrs. Field looks back on the old palmy days when Robinson Crusoe and Evenings at Home, Blue Beard, and Cinderella, Pilgrim's Progress, and Jack the Giant-Killer were universal favourites, to be read again and again with unbroken interest, and hoarded up as treasures among the household gods. Instead of sickly dialogues on original sin and juvenile depravity, discussions as to 'Hell and Hades,' 'Is Life worth Living?' or 'the Possibility of a Future,' they had teaching of a fresher, truer, and manlier cast. They learned their lesson for life from Dick Whittington on Highgate Hill; from Bruce

sen

ar

of

mo

the

sur

is r

is i

Th

OW.

SOL

alm

or l

mo

do

reli

sup

juv

the

or

livi

rea Kn

in r

har

Th

ligh

who

wid

the

me

qui

lett

fert a t

spo

frui

watching the spider on the ceiling; Christian at the wicket gate; Blondel and his harp; Crusoe finding the footprint in the sand; or Diamonds and Pearls at the well. And, if they needed any text in addition to a page of the Bible, they had it at all events in brave and reverent words of beauty and strength:

'Come, children, let us Praise Him, for He is exceeding great; let us Bless Him for He is very good. The birds sing praises to Him as they warble in the green shade. But we are better than they and can praise Him better, the Sovereign of all. His crown is of light, His throne among the stars, His dominion is over all worlds. Can we make Him hear who is above the stars? We need not raise our voices to the stars, for he heareth when we only whisper. He that filleth the Heavens is here also' (Barbauld, *Prose Hymns*).

If they needed to know anything of God's special ways with men, they might have learned from First Principles for Children, by P. M., as long ago as 1780, that though 'He regards not whether our needles and pins are big or little, our clothes ugly or pretty, yet He does regard how we behave about them, and whether young people lie and cheat, and get out of temper, and waste time in talking of what they don't under-They might have learned the value of pluck from Barring Out, good nature and honesty from Simple Susan, the art of pleading from The Trial of an Ox for Killing a Man, truth from Short Stories, amusement from Anecdotes for Children, wit from The Riddler's Riddle Book, each volume in paper covers, and adorned with woodcuts, to be had of John Rusher, of Banbury, 1820, price 1d. But all such regrets are now vain. The hands of the clock cannot be put back; and we must be content with the mass of healthy literature still happily within reach. However numerous the books which pander to the worst tastes and appetites of young readers, there is still a good supply of healthy fiction from writers who have done their best in the cause of sound teaching, beauty, grace, and truth, to purify the taste, delight the imagination, and charm the fancy. There is hardly need to mention the names of such writers as Oliphant, Yonge, Christie Murray, Black, Jean Ingelow, Besant, and Barrie; or such books as Tom Browne, Jan of the Mill, Lorna Doone, or Alice in Won-Their name is legion, their praise in every mouth.

And, in addition to sound fiction of this kind, there is to be noted the broader, deeper, and more continuous stream furnished by a large portion of our periodical literature, the main tendency of which is at least for good. If it be true that some of the magazine fiction is rather silly, or highly

MUX

wicket rint in if they ey had ty and

great; aises to er than rown is worlds. ot raise

's with r Chilegards clothes about out of underfrom Susan, lling a tes for ume in f John ets are ; and re still which eaders, rs who eauty, nation, on the Iurray, oks as Won-

outh.

nere is

stream

re, the

e true

highly

sentimental, or too crammed with special views, there is yet a residuum of healthy and harmless food for young readers, of distinct value. The great regret is that where we look for more than this-from the hands of Religious Societies such as the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the Religious Tract Society, one of whose special missions it should surely be to get hold of young readers of fiction—the result is meagre and unsatisfactory. In neither case, taken broadly, is it worthy of the cause, or the cost and toil of production. The Religious Tract Society have, of course, to advocate their own special views, with which, narrow, morbid, and unwholesome as they often are, we have no concern at present; and almost every juvenile book issuing from their press is more or less flavoured or imbued with the so-called religious treacle which passes for sound doctrine. But the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is a Church Society, richly endowed, conducted by able men, and, apart from all its direct religious teaching, ought to provide an ample and magnificent supply of sound, wholesome, and high-class fiction for young people. For doctrine, science, and as pure literature, their juvenile books should take the highest rank. They who know them best cannot bestow any such commendation, but are sometimes driven to use such descriptive words as twaddle or wishy-washy, no salt, not a spark of fire, no flame of living truth. One result of this is that thousands of young readers, yawning over the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, seek for food and amusement elsewhere; where, in many cases, with greater or less success—as in the Monthly Packet, Good Words, and even the Sunday Magazine—the old hard line between sacred and secular has been broken down. That which is true, good, and first-rate of its kind in a secular light, may be and ought to be equally good, true, and pure, when viewed as sacred; and neither need be dry or tasteless as sawdust. The impression that this is true shows itself widely, and in other periodical literature—the more widely the better. Nor is the value of such a movement to be measured by the exact dimensions of its own channel. It is quietly raising the tone of literary taste, and may purify the appetite for noble and true fiction throughout the domain of letters. When a great river rolls through a land, it not only fertilizes every meadow and waste that lines its course, but by a thousand secret channels distributes into remote and lonely spots of the wilderness, rivulets and tiny streams of refreshing and pure water. The result is new life, vigour, beauty, and fruit.

VOL. XXXV.-NO, LXIX.

po

di

A

th

hu

lit na

tal

sci

Te

spi

mı

ve

wh

as

the

car

lat

us,

rev

the

A

nee

of

for

tain

let

van

liev

trut

mu:

acci

rest

con

and

Psa

pro

thes

of '

a ve

## ART. VII.—CHEYNE'S BAMPTON LECTURES AND THE DATE OF THE PSALTER.

I. The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter (the Bampton Lectures, 1889). By T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D. (London, 1891.)

The Psalms. Book I. (Cambridge Bible for Schools). Edited by A. F. KIRKPATRICK, B.D. (Cambridge, 1891.)
 Psalm CX. By JOHN SHARPE, D.D. (Cambridge, 1892.)

THE most interesting and important theological, we might even say literary, problem of the day is the particular course which the Jewish nation took in its religious development before the coming of Christ, and the times at which it passed through the various stages. The problem is interesting, because it involves the arrangement, in their due sequence, of historical facts, theological ideas, and ecclesiastical institutions, showing as far as possible the precise manner in which they mutually affected one another, which was cause and which effect. The problem is difficult, but is not too enormous in its size. There is no fear of overtaxing the memory; it is the imagination which has too much scope, and needs to be held in check. And undoubtedly the results of the investigation are important. By a believer in Revelation it can never be regarded as immaterial how or when God spake. A Christian must needs deem that study of cardinal importance which throws light on the preparation for, and the Person and teaching of, Christ, The historical critic cannot afford to pass over the records of that nation which, though in numbers and material rule third rate, stands first in its influence on the religions of the world. Misarranged, misused, misinterpreted, the Old Testament may be proved or imagined to be; it will never be a book which either religious people or students can afford to leave unused upon a shelf.

For more than two thousand years the Church of God has had her Old Testament in her hand. The Book of the new and better Covenant corrected and supplemented, but could not supplant it in her regard. The Jews, though it is their own and their only book, have not appreciated it so highly or used it so constantly as the Christians. Nevertheless, though the handbook of devotion and a mine of theological moral teaching to Jew and Christian alike for so many generations, it has not till our own times been critically studied.

AND

(the

M.A.,

dited

(892.)

might

course

oment

passed

g, be-

nce, of

nstitu-

which

e and

enor-

mory;

eds to

he in-

tion it

spake.

al im-

nd the

ic can-

which,

first in

ranged,

proved

er reli-

upon a

of God

of the

ed, but

gh it is

d it so

everthe-

o many

studied.

The science of Biblical criticism is, to all intents and purposes, a modern science.

It seems to us specially important at the present time to distinguish between Biblical criticism on the one hand, and the methods and results of some Biblical critics on the other. A science should not, though it is natural, be discredited by the mistakes or excesses of its professors. Biblical criticism is an attempt to apply the greatest of God's natural gifts, the human reason, to the investigation of the authorship, date. literary form, and character of one of the greatest of His supernatural gifts, the written word of God. Believers in Revelation take up an utterly false position if they complain of the careful scientific study and the minute criticism which the Old Testament is now receiving. There is much to regret in the spirit in which many of the critics make their investigations, much to disapprove of in the arguments which they employ, very much that is open to serious objection in the results at which they arrive. Nevertheless, 'abusus non tollit usum'; as faithful stewards of God's good gifts, Biblical students of the nineteenth century must needs use critical methods. We cannot fail to see that the form in which the Book of Revelation has come down to us invites, nay rather demands from us, the exercise upon it of the human reason. A historical revelation is necessarily open to historical illustration, and therefore, on strict principles of justice, to historical criticism. A more accurate determination of the historical setting must needs tend to produce greater accuracy in our interpretation of the divine teaching. The divine treasure necessarily took form and shape from the earthly vessels in which it was contained. It is thus impossible for us to abjure criticism, but let us take care to start on our critical investigations from the vantage ground of faith. We need not fear the results. Believing and reverent criticism can do nothing against the truth but for the truth.

The remarks which we have made by way of introduction must not be regarded as intended to smooth the way to the acceptance of what are sometimes called the established results of Old Testament Biblical criticism—we mean such conclusions as Wellhausen has come to upon the Pentateuch and the early history of Israel, or Professor Cheyne on the Psalms and the Old Testament generally. Rather they are prompted by our thorough dissent from, and our dislike of, these conclusions. It is because we believe that very many of 'the established critical results' are not only false, but in a very high degree mischievous—destructive of all true belief

I

d

te

01

it

cl

di

of

of

to

WI

in

ed

ha

th

his

dit

ma

of

of

fai

als

wh

in

dis

que

in

of '

bee

beg

tau

mu

WO

uni

tea

eith

rud

nee

her

WOI

In t

in Revelation-that we are most anxious that they shall be demolished in the only possible way, i.e. by the critical use of critical methods. The religious instinct of most good Christian people, in some cases their implicit and unqualified belief in the Truth's own words, incline them—and, we think, rightly 1-to reject these results peremptorily. Those who are not scholars and students cannot be rightly blamed for so acting. In worldly affairs practical men deal thus summarily with the conclusions of theorists. For the discernment of spiritual things the innocent and the holy, the humble and the reverent, have within their grasp valid spiritual tests. It is, however, plain that the religious instinct which cannot allege any rational grounds in its support can only exercise a personal, and never a rational, influence on others. It is only by critical arguments, and not by religious sentiments, however deep and true, that critical arguments can be met in the Church at large. We believe confidently that this can be done. Critical conclusions such as those we have referred to, can be demonstrated to be irrational and uncritical, but for this purpose we must use critical weapons.

And our use of the critical weapons must be sympathetic and candid. Our only chance of conquering unbelieving criticism is to recognize fully that which gives it its strength—the truth contained in it. We must not imagine that our trained and developed reason, when used upon Revelation, will purely and simply confirm the conclusions come to by our uncritical faith. We shall be led in the course of our study to discern new truths and group old truths in new ways. More than this, we shall detect and correct erroneous ideas. The divine Revelation and human ideas about it are to be carefully distinguished. Some of the latter, being merely the fashioning of fallible human minds, will be shaken. Revelation itself, we know, is a kingdom which cannot be shaken,

and which will remain.

There are some who may be inclined to ask, What has this new weapon—Biblical criticism—which you estimate at so high a value, done for the advancement of the truth hitherto? We can see the mischief it has worked, but we cannot discern the good. We should answer, Biblical criticism has forced men to realize, and this not otiosely but effectively, the human element in Revelation. We believe it to be hardly less important to recognize and duly appreciate the human element in Revelation than to maintain the

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm 1}$  We think so after weighing what Professor Cheyne has written about the hallowing of criticism.

ll be se of hrislified hink, o are or so narily nt of and s. It annot ercise It is nents, net in an be ed to, ut for

Oct.

athetic ieving ngth—at our on, will by our study ways. I ideas. I to be ely the Revela-haken,

nat has nate at e truth but we al critiely but elieve it appretain the

correlative truth—the true humanity of the Incarnate Word. More particularly, criticism has impressed on men's minds the essential diversity in the different parts, and the remarkable development in the successive periods, of Revelation. Church teachers, we think, have been inclined to dwell too exclusively on the divine side of Revelation, and the consequent unity of its teaching throughout. Multæ terricolis linguæ, cælestibus una. But the highest and deepest truths suffer if regarded exclusively. Even the divinity of Revelation is but one side of divine truth in regard to it. Revelation came through men and to men; through men of very different characters to men of very different circumstances; through men of every stage of growth in regard to religious attainment, to men belonging to widely separate ages in the history of the world. It is wrapped up in human history and philosophy, it is expressed in human language, it is compiled and fashioned by human editors. A human element so substantial must needs have had a reflex influence upon and conditioned the character of the divine. The believers in God and Christ who study the history of the world and reflect on the past and present condition of man, must acknowledge the terrible hindrances which man's weakness and sinfulness place in the way of the spread of divine truth. Thus an intelligent and critical appreciation of the human element in its essence and bearings cannot fail to help us to discern what Revelation as a whole is, and also to teach us in what sense Revelation is divine, and in what sense one. It may be observed also that sad experience in cognate spheres indicates to us that we cannot afford to dispense with such a help. Mistakes of disastrous consequence have been made by men in their conceptions of unity in divine things. Has not a wrong conception of the unity of the Church—a fundamental article of the Christian faith been a chief cause of the disunion of Christendom? We are beginning to discern now-our practical difficulties have taught us-that the unity of the Church of one generation must be unity in diversity, and that the unity of faith and worship binding together the Church in all generations is unity of growth and development. Criticism is, we think, teaching us a similar lesson in the sphere of Revelation. In either case the methods of teaching have been harsh and rude. Otherwise perhaps we should never have learned the needful lesson. Through the assaults of her enemies, through her own errors, mistakes, and failures, God has been ever wont to bring His Church to a clearer knowledge of the truth. In the ecclesiastical sphere we have been taught, if indeed it

can be said we have as yet learned the lesson, what true unity is, by schisms and divisions involving grievous sin; in the sphere of Revelation, by arguments which cannot be regarded as free from irreverence and unbelief. Biblical critics. ofttimes with rude and irreverent hand, break down the ancient and sacred structure of the Old Testament, and show us in triumph its several bricks and stones. They proclaim aloud that the Church in all generations has been entirely mistaken as to its origin and composition. The mass of it is centuries younger than has been supposed, its chief masterbuilders men of a different age. We have been fundamentally wrong in the relative dates we assigned to its different parts, we have not allowed sufficiently for the constant work of the restorers or redactors of various ages who sometimes imitated the older workmen in their style. They hurt our feelings, they wound our prejudices, very often we entirely dissent from their reasonings. But we have already some compensation, and we have faith to believe that we shall have more. They teach us that the Old Testament, like an English cathedral, combines different styles of different ages, the many thoughts of many minds. They convince us that Revelation, though of divine origin as we firmly believe, was no exotic on earth, no hot-house plant, but a vigorous tree which took deep root downwards in a national life, and spread wide her branches over the whole world. Thus they bring home to us almost with the force of a new revelation that 'God spake unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners,' and that it was 'men' who 'spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost.'

We do not, however, profess to be panegyrists, but rather critics of the critical school, and our present object is to overthrow some of the results which they claim to have established in regard to the authorship and date of the Psalms. These results, as formulated by Professor Cheyne in his *Bampton Lectures*, are in direct opposition to the tradition of the Jewish Church. He has taken a long step in advance of the position of former critics, or his own in earlier years. The definiteness of the results at which he arrives is very noticeable. Whilst we object strongly to the reasoning by which he arrives at his conclusions, and dislike extremely the conclusions themselves, we cannot deny that his criticism is constructive as well as destructive; and we cannot complain that he minimizes the issue between the traditional and the critical theory, or veils his statements or arguments in doubt-

ful and hesitating language.

tl

to

d

d

K

SC

d

aı

01

te

su

true

n; in

be reritics,

n the

show

claim

tirely

of it

aster-

unda-

s dif-

nstant some-

y hurt

re enlready

at we

of dif-

y con-

firmly

but a

tional world.

a new ophets

'men'

rather

is to

have

of the

yne in

adition dvance

years.

is very

ing by

ely the

cism is

mplain

nd the doubt-

It is necessary at the outset of any critical investigation as to the date of the Psalter to define one's position in regard to the authority and value of the titles. If we regard them as of infallible authority originally, and ascribe all the errors discernible in them to the accidents of transcription, to which they might be regarded as especially liable, it will be useless for us even to consider the arguments contained in Professor Cheyne's book. He is contemptuous in his utter rejection 'of the time-honoured but irrational tradition' contained in them. When starting with books iv. and v. he has arrived at book ii. of the Psalter and is discussing the occasion of Psalm li., he is able to assert that hitherto 'the titles of the Psalms have not yielded a single trustworthy biographical reference, and that a faithful exegesis proves that the title of Psalm li. is no exception' (p. 161). When he arrives at book i. he remarks, 'I need not stay to prove that these titles are no more authoritative than those which assign the collection of sayings in the centre of Proverbs (x.-xxii. 16) to David's keen-witted successor. They do, indeed, represent an early tradition respecting the origin of the first Psalter, but it is probable that they also represent an early misunderstanding of that tradition' (p. 190). It would be difficult, we think, to produce any instance in which the title of a psalm has been allowed any substantial influence on the critical conclusion as to its authorship and occasion at which Professor Cheyne arrives.

The value of the titles of the different Psalms is, to our mind, very difficult to appraise. We have no means of determining when they were first prefixed. It is hardly doubtful that this was done, not by the authors, but by those who at various times made collections of psalms, e.g. Davidic, Korahite, Asaphic, &c. That it was customary for psalms or songs to have titles in early times we may infer from David's dirge over Saul and Jonathan, and from Habakkuk's psalm. That the titles were not prefixed casually but with authority we may argue from the fact that we have only one tradition in regard to them. The variations in manuscripts and versions are far less common than, on such a point, might have been expected. The LXX Version of the Psalms was made from a copy in which the titles were substantially the same as our own.1 Considering the character and history and date of that version, the confirmation it gives on this matter to the Hebrew text is very remarkable. That the titles are supported by substantial ancient authority is thus evident; still, from their

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cf. Ewald, quoted by Pusey, Daniel, note, p. 323.

189 of

edi

Da

the

of

He

is s

· l'c

&c

sho

we:

aut

Do

to

pos

the

diff

ado

to

ear

He

stil

rec

ran

acc

mo

bea

hav

Ma Psa

mo

frai

froi

fals

pre

last

his But

very nature, they cannot have the same authority or sacred character as the sacred text itself. We might hesitate to say that 'they form no part of the authentic,' but at any rate they form no part of the original text. They come with the authority of a musical or literary editor, not of the inspired author. They embody traditions always ancient, but not always trustworthy; they sometimes contain inferences from internal evidence, made hastily on insufficient or even on mistaken grounds. It seems to be unwise to attempt to estimate their value as a class. They are sometimes valuable, sometimes worthless. On the whole we must agree with Professor Kirkpatrick's cautious conclusion: 'It appears, then, that while on the one hand the titles cannot be regarded as in all cases giving certain and trustworthy information concerning the authorship of the Psalms, on the other hand they are not to be one and all peremptorily rejected as purely arbitrary and conjectural.' 2 We should claim for the titles that they be treated with the respect due to ancient traditions. Though they cannot be allowed absolutely to decide questions of authorship, &c., they ought not to be rejected off-hand and without adequate reason. If false, they have to be proved false. The onus probandi rests on those who deny their truth.

Professor Cheyne apparently imagines that if all the titles of the Psalms were placed in one scale, and one of his conjectural emendations or his 'cannot imagines' or 'must have beens' in the other, the former would kick the beam. Note how he regards a conjecture of his own, of which 'we have no ancient record,' as 'perhaps more deserving of credence' than a statement in 2 Mac. (pp. 11, 12); and his remark (p. 173), 'We can hardly overrate the carelessness of tradition on such points,' i.e. original occasion of a psalm. However false the titles, he has to account rationally for their presence in the Psalter. On occasion, we observe, he can argue from their absence (p. 9). His own theory involves him in special diffi-culties here. He ascribes twenty-four out of the sixty-one Psalms of books iv. and v. (edited by Simon the Maccabee) to the Greek period (pre-Maccabean and Maccabean); ten out of these twenty-four are assigned by their titles to David. Practically all the fifteen 'Greek' Psalms of books ii. and iii. (edited by a Maccabean editor) have inscriptions which place them amongst Davidic, Asaphic, Korahite, or Solomonic Psalms. Professor Cheyne thus brings together two things which the traditional theory is unable to do, viz. the authors

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cheyne, p. 190.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Psalms, bk. i. Introd. p. xxix.

sacred

to say

ly rate

ith the

spired

ut not

s from

en on

npt to

luable,

e with

ppears,

garded

on con-

purely

e titles

ditions.

estions

nd and

d false.

e titles

is con-

Note

e have dence'

p. 173),

on such

alse the

n their al diffi-

kty-one

bee) to

ten out

David.

and iii.

h place

of the inscriptions and the inscriptions themselves. In consequence their importance is greatly enhanced. It is Maccabean editors who ascribe Greek, and even Maccabean, psalms to David and other ancient names. Now, there is some sense in the idea that the Jews naturally called a great ancient psalm, of whose authorship they were ignorant, by the name David. He was by tradition the father of their sacred song. There is something to be said for the theory that originally the title 'l'david' and the like were placed at the head of Davidic, &c., collections, and not at the head of each psalm. But why should the editors give to psalms—some at least of which were contemporaneous with themselves, some of whose authors they personally knew-a false and misleading title? Does it not seem simply ridiculous to prefix an ancient title to essentially and notoriously modern psalms-psalms composed, as we are told, because the ancient ones did not meet the requirements of the times? (pp. 9, 100).

The explanation which Professor Cheyne gives of this difficulty can hardly be regarded as plausible. The collectors added 'l'david' to thirteen Psalms in Books iv. and v., 'in order to give these books a certain external similarity to the two earliest. The Septuagint translator, or the writer of the Hebrew MS. which he used, sprinkled this title more freely still '(p. 69). 'In some cases even in the Hebrew text, the recipients of this honour seem to have been picked out at random.' The titles would thus appear to be in part unaccountable, in part added to give a pseudo-antique tone to modern compositions. Again in books ii. and iii. the Maccabean editor wished 'to infuse a leaven of contemporary thought and feeling into hymnals which otherwise might not have been sufficiently valued' (p. 100), so he inserted some Maccabean Psalms with ancient titles. It is curious that the Psalms ancient should not be valued, and yet that the Psalms modern should need, to gain acceptance, ancient titles. For the editor to give old labels to his new psalms-psalms framed to meet the modern taste—was to divert attention from them and to defeat his own purpose.

The title ascribing Psalm cx. to David, whether true or false, furnishes us with a strong argument against its Maccabean authorship in the form in which Professor Cheyne presents it. It was Simon the Maccabee who edited the last two books of the Psalter, and so it was by him, or under his directions, that the title 'l'david' was prefixed to Psalm cx. But it was Simon's own encomium, Professor Cheyne asserts,

omonic things authors

xix.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> So Professor Cheyne, pp. 11, 12.

189:

rec

den

Old

whi

be wri

dev

The

just

not

the

acc

to a

acc

spi

tha

and

OW

tha

as

was

me line the

reg

SW

Psa

us,

vel

the

Th

ele

Da

flu

Psa

rejects when adduced for a traditional theory.

Professor Cheyne's main reason for the post-exilic date which he assigns to the Psalter, is derived from the history of religion in Israel. Critical investigations have brought about this result, that every critical inquiry in regard to this must begin with the canonical prophets of the eighth century B.C. It is in the prophetical literature that we are allowed to have our earliest firm standing ground, and most ancient solid material with which to work. But there is a consequent result very remarkable, quite inexplicable, or at least, as yet, wholly The prophetical literature is isolated, the unexplained. fundamental literature is itself deprived of all firm foundation. The prophets are supposed sufficiently to account for everything that is noble and unique in the religion or influence of Israel; but no sufficient answer is given to the question, who or what accounts for the prophets? Till the critics have done something substantial in regard to this, they must not talk of established results. The situation is entirely of their own making. They have turned the patriarchal narratives into prophetical fictions; they have post-dated by centuries the greater part of the Law; they have eliminated nearly all the spiritual elements from the pre-exilic history; they have dated the birth of the Jewish Church in the Babylonian Exile; they have transferred the bulk of the Psalter to a period historically almost unknown in the Persian domination. In consequence they have left the prophets, like Melchizedek, without father, without mother, without genealogy, or, like Mohammed's Coffin, suspended unsupported in the air. They so far

P. 142 and Note d, p. 154.

Professor Cheyne explains the inscription to Psalm ci. similarly (see p. 69).

whom e of the troy, its an unred his fixed to refer to a of the ot have aλωμὼν m lxxii. In only e use of

hich he lic date story of t about is must ury B.C. to have at solid nt result wholly ed, the ndation. everyience of on, who ve done talk of eir own res into ries the all the re dated e; they orically equence without

Moham-

y so far

similarly

recognize the laws of gravitation, that a very marked tendency is discernible amongst them to lighten the prophets themselves. In the prophets, as in the other books of the Old Testament, there are, we are told, traces of later editing which must be removed, critical adjustments which have to be made, whole sections which, as occurring in pre-exilic writings, are opposed to 'a truly historical conception of the development of Israelitish religion and must be eliminated.' 1 They may lighten the prophetic ship as they will, but it cannot float in air. Soon we may expect the advent of a critic just a little more daring and logical than his predecessors, who shall assert that the time has at length come to consign not only the Psalms but the whole of the Old Testament literature into the days of the Exile and beyond. Meanwhile the weak point in the critics' position is obvious; they cannot account for the prophets. Religious teachers have been wont to ascribe, somewhat irrationally, it may be, all that was unaccountable in the teaching of Revelation to the direct inspiration of the Spirit of God. The critics have taught us that this is insufficient. In the sacred writings, account must and can be given of the human agents and the earthly setting. We, on our part, must never allow them to depart from their own fundamental principles. We must never cease to insist that they shall account for the prophets and their teaching on rational principles.

On the traditional theory, more especially as modified by a sound criticism, David, with the writings ascribed to him, was an important link in the chain of Israel's religious development. The pupil of Samuel, who was the first of the prophetic line and the reviver of Israel's spiritual life, he was also the contemporary of many prophets of name, who might be regarded as the progenitors of the great teachers of the eighth century B.C. The earliest traditions mark him out as the sweet singer of Israel, and contain specimens of his songs or Psalms. David's writings, if they have indeed come down to us, should help us somewhat to understand the advanced development of the teaching of the prophetical writings. But they have not come down, Professor Cheyne is able to assure us (p. 192). David, the Psalm-writer, is (critically speaking) dead. The only extant, indubitably Davidic compositions, are the elegies in 2 Sam. i. 19-27; iii. 33, 34. 'Genuine relics of the Davidic and Solomonic poetry might conceivably have influenced the Psalmists, and it is not unnatural to imagine a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Professor Robertson's Baird Lectures, chap. vi.; Cheyne's Psalter, p. 31.

tha

tha

COI

CO

XX

nic

im

sai

in

m

in

to

pa

pa

di

ha

fr

ne

Si

of

no

th

W

a

ro

A

a

u

c

Davidic element in Psalms xviii. and lx. Only we must be on our guard against pleasant illusions. No concessions can be made which a conservative of the old school would think worth accepting' (pp. 193-4). We are thankful to Professor Cheyne for being so frank, we are glad the issue is so definite, and we agree with him as to the value of the concessions he is able to make. Tradition, and early tradition, regarded David as the chief Psalmist; developed criticism maintains that David had no hand in the Psalter. The magnitude of the issue between the traditional and the critical theories is not, however, even now fully stated. Tradition was utterly mistaken, not only as to the authorship, but also as to the age of the Psalter. None of the fourteen generations between David and the carrying away to Babylon, had any hand in its composition. 'Psalm xviii. (says Professor Cheyne) is the only possible pre-Exile Psalm ' (p. 258).

The David of tradition, and not only he but all his pre-Exile poetic descendants are dead, but they leave a vacant place in Israel's history and development. Professor Cheyne acknowledges this. He is obliged to imagine a school of writers—symbolical Davids—to account for the literary character of the book of Amos, &c. (p. 194). These are not the writers of our Psalms, but they prepared the way for them. He has thus to assume the existence of men whose memory has utterly perished, and of writings of which no fragments are extant. Rejecting the materials for the history of religion in Israel with which tradition supplies him, he has

to invent materials of his own.

The rejection of the traditional theory is, however, necessary, he tells us. 'From the point of view of the history of art, not less than from that of the history of religion, the supposition that we have Davidic Psalms presents insuperable

difficulties '(pp. 192-3).

We cannot understand how the history of art occasions Professor Cheyne any substantial, far less insuperable, difficulties. He himself says: 'Happily the beautiful lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i. 19–27) has never had its Davidic origin questioned. But for artistic skill and variety of contrast nothing in the Old Testament equals the song (or, perhaps, the songs) of the poetess Deborah.' Surely we may argue, so far as the history of art is concerned, from Deborah's ode (undeniably ancient in date), and David's elegy, to the possibility of Davidic Psalms. No essential difference of poetic style separates between them.

Article on 'Hebrew Poetry,' in Aids to the Bible Student, p. 63.

must be

ions can

ild think

Professor

definite.

sions he

regarded

naintains

nitude of

es is not,

erly mis-

ne age of

en David

its com-

the only

his pre-

a vacant Cheyne

school of

literary

are not

way for en whose

vhich no

e history

n, he has

r, neces-

istory of

the sup-

uperable

occasions

ble, diffinentation

r had its

d variety

173

It will be found worth while, we think, to examine the positive reasons given by Professor Cheyne for his opinion that the pre-exilic psalms must have been rude. He thinks that before the Exile 'the service of religious song was not committed to any special class, but was the privilege of the congregation at large (2 Sam. vi. 5, Amos v. 21-23, Is.

xxx. 29)' (p. 194).

Professor Cheyne ignores numerous statements of Chronicles here; and also I Kings x. 12, for public instruments imply an official choir. The passages he refers to can only be said to show the meagreness of his case; 2 Sam. vi. 5 comes in point of date before the temple, and even before David's musical arrangements for religious service. There is nothing in the passage of Amos to indicate whether the music referred to is the work of the congregation or of an official choir. The passage in Isaiah only proves that the congregation took a part in some of the temple music.

Professor Cheyne's next arguments are truly remarkable:

'As late as the fall of Jerusalem the noise of the Chaldaean soldiery in the temple is likened to that made by the worshippers on a feast-day (Lam. ii. 7). When the singing was so rough, recalling the humble origin of the Hebrew t'hillah,1 the psalms themselves cannot have been too polished in style.'

It is dangerous arguing, as every parish priest should know, from rough singing to rude hymns. There is, indeed, no connexion between the two. But what proof is there of rough singing? Lam. ii. 7 says not a word which suggests singing of any kind. The noise of the Chaldæans is likened to the noise in the temple courts at the great festivals. Would not the noise and uproar on such occasions from the crowds of worshippers with their animal sacrifices be a more obvious and fitting comparison than the noise of a hymn, however roughly sung?

Professor Cheyne refers to yet another passage to complete

song (or, we may eborah's y, to the rence of

p. 63.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The explanation of this word on p. 460 will be found to be amusing and characteristic. Lagarde has connected the Hebrew 'Hallel' with an Arabic root which means 'to call or cry out,' and the connexion has been accepted by Wellhausen. Consequently thillah (E.V. 'praise') is 'properly the obligatory shouting of the worshipper on a visit to the sanctuary. 'At any rate,' says Professor Cheyne, 'the shouting of the Arabs will help us to realize the humble origin of the Hebrew thillah, and the rough character of the original singing in the temple.' Professor Cheyne and his friends thus ignore specific and historical differences (such as we know existed between Israelites and Arabians in matters of religion), and allege uncertain etymologies to support imaginary correspondences and developments.

his proof: 'We might even infer from Amos v. 21-23 that they [i.e. the temple hymns] were as formal and unspiritual as the sacrifices which they accompanied.' His last argument took its rise in a false exegesis and an uncertain etymology; this, in a confusion of ideas. What was it which made the sacrifices formal and unspiritual? Not anything inherent in them, i.e. their material character; but the religious character of the offerers, who offered them with unclean hands and an impure heart. Thus the analogy wholly fails. The songs, we infer, were offensive to God, not because of their own inherent defects, but because of the formality and unspirituality of those who sang them.

The arguments against Davidic Psalms from the history of art are flimsy at the best and break down badly on examination. The arguments from the history of religion are much more substantial and deserve careful consideration. David's personal character undoubtedly causes a difficulty. None of us can have failed to notice the difference between the David of history and the David of the Psalms. We must not, however, make too much of this. A grievous discrepancy between the prayers and lives of good men is by no means uncommon in any age. There are, moreover, epochs when such discrepancies are specially common and gross, e.g. at transition times, when new leaven is working with all the power of essential newness and before it has had power to leaven the whole lump. David, Professor Cheyne says, 'is the hero of

history combined.

In the character of David incongruous elements are plainly discernible. On the one hand his passions are strong, and they have not been subdued or regulated by well-established customs or laws. On the other hand the grace of God is mighty within him. He is great alike in doing and suffering. He is at once the favourite of the people and the beloved of God. Can we, under these circumstances, be surprised that

the transition from rudeness to culture' (p. 194), or, as we

should be inclined to say, from the times of the Judges to the

times of the kings and prophets. We ought not to be surprised if we find him unrivalled amongst Old Testament

characters in his inconsistencies. These may be traced

hardly less clearly in the history alone than in the Psalms and

hur esp late Eas be exe me

1892

he sins

ind his tho spr ove inst tho step

she

asc

and

har

the The true tac sho into reli to bee

of son this cre cas Pro

Psa

bee

ord (wl

<sup>1</sup> Notice here, however, the gross exaggeration into which Professor Cheyne falls when, in refusing to King David Ps. xxxii., he says (p. 235): 'I cannot, at the bidding of a late and uncritical tradition, convert a David into a Paul.' Would not a less complete conversion have sufficed, or is Ps. xxxii. to be assigned to the Christian era?

3 that cual as ument cology; le the cent in cracter and an songs, own piritu-

Oct.

much avid's one of David , howtween mmon n dissition ver of en the ero of as we to the e surament raced is and

lainly g, and lished God is fering. wed of d that

ofessor (235): David d, or is he should be capable of the noblest deeds and the grossest sins? Though David shows at times that recklessness of human life which was natural in those early ages, and more especially in the captain of a band of outlaws; though his later life was marked with the voluptuousness natural to an Eastern king; though on one occasion he falls so low as to be actually a murderer and an adulterer-he nevertheless exemplifies in a wonderful degree the virtues of patience, meekness, pure love, true penitence, and faith in God's unseen hand. Do we say the combination of virtue and vice, selfindulgence and self-restraint, is impossible? Nature and history furnish us with analogous cases. David's life is like those days of transition from winter to summer—those hot spring days which become cold and chilly when a cloud passes over the face of the sun. And how closely David in his instability and thorough inequality with himself resembles those ancient Saxon kings for whom there was such a short step between the throne and the cloister, the life of bloodshedding and excess and the life of religious observance and asceticism—men whom at times you might call murderers, and at times saints!

Under the special circumstances of the case we cannot admit the tradition—that the David of history is the first and the most famous of the psalmists—to be a priori inconceivable. The actions of David's life, and the deep insight into spiritual truths which he at times manifests, have many points of contact with the feelings and aspirations of the Psalms. We should maintain, for example, that Ps. li. and Ps. xxxii. fit into 2 Sam. xi. and 2 Sam. xii. more closely than the inner religious life and the outward conduct of holy men are wont to do. Professor Cheyne's difficulty, however, has not yet been fully met. His point is that the religious ideas of the Psalms ascribed to David are too highly developed to have been conceived in David's times.

We are not concerned to maintain the Davidic authorship of all the Psalms which are entitled Psalms of David. In some of these marks of a later age may be discerned. We think, however, no sufficient reason has been alleged to discredit the traditional ascription in the greater number of cases. We can make no concessions on this point which Professor Cheyne would think worth accepting.

We are quite ready to admit that the standard of faith and life contained in the Psalms is much beyond that of an ordinary Israelite. This fact presents no difficulty, even if (which is not probable) the earlier Psalms were in general

the

bot

of I

mei

is n

foll

as r Psa

bey

be

trut

ago

love

nar

to e

feel

ano

ligh

anc

the

kno

the

Da

Chi

scio

Chi

258

psa

eith

Th

den

the

mea

Chi

the

me

in 1

thi

'the

Chi

infe

and ordinary devotional use from David's time onwards. The truths and aspirations expressed in Christian formularies of devotion, nay in David's own Psalms, are much beyond the intelligent grasp and the ordinary life of the mass of Christians of the nineteenth century A.D. It is part of our case that David was an extraordinary man. The history gives us essentially false notions if David does not surpass the men of his own and the succeeding generations, not only in the diversity of his natural gifts, but also in those vicissitudes and experiences which tend to elicit and develop inherent powers. Professor Cheyne indeed says (p. 190) that he 'was not an isolated student-poet.' David, we imagine, was not a student at all. His poetical powers were developed by suffering and by stirring incident, not in study. 'A child of the people,' he goes on to say, 'he cannot (if at least we can trust historical analogy) have had an absolutely unique talent of song. The divine fire must have passed from others to him, and again from him to others. Why may not successors of David have been his equals in natural and his superiors in spiritual capacities?' Professor Cheyne here seems to forget the timehonoured adage, Poeta nascitur non fit. Of the gift of poesy it may be most truly said, 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth.' Why have we not, we might ask, Shakespeares and Miltons in every generation? Moreover he utterly ignores the circumstances of the preceding and succeeding generations, neither of which were favourable to the development of such spiritual gifts as the Psalms require. A book of religious poetry emanating from the rude, unsettled, and unspiritual days of the Judges would have been an anachronism. On the other hand, Solomon's age was too peaceful, luxurious, and worldly for devotional litera-Thus there seem to be solid reasons why, to a considerable extent, David might stand alone as a religious poet. His isolation is only apparent. Second-rate religious poetry of such remote antiquity would not be likely to survive.

Professor Cheyne objects further 'that the most productive and spiritually the richest of the ages of psalmody cannot have been the earliest' (p. 193). To this we may answer, the most productive and spiritually the richest of the ages of written prophecy was beyond question the earliest. What prophetical period can we compare with that of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah? We may add that, according to his own theory, the earliest period of psalmody, that of the Persian domination, was surpassed in richness by no other, and that

XUM

wards.

ularies

peyond

nass of

of our

history

surpass

ot only

vicissi-

lop in-

O) that

nagine,

reloped

child of

in trust

lent of

m, and

David

piritual

e time-

poesy

listeth,

whence

might

More-

ceding

ourable

ms re-

e rude,

have

's age

litera-

a con-

s poet.

poetry

roduc-

cannot

nswer,

ages of

What

Hosea,

is own

Persian

d that

the earliest Psalms (those of Bk. i. as a whole) are superior both in regard to poetic art and depth of thought to the Psalms of Books iv. and v. Have we not abundant proof that development, whether in poetic art or in depth of spiritual teaching, is not continuous, cannot be measured by time, and does not follow the lines of natural development in other matters?

We have admitted the discrepancy between David's life as recorded in the history and the devout aspirations of the We should also maintain that the Psalms are beyond David's ordinary religious level. He seems to us to be able just to touch, or perhaps to clutch convulsively at, truths which, nevertheless, he cannot firmly grasp. In his agonies of suffering and doubt, or in the enthusiasm of his love and confidence, he climbs to heights beyond his ordinary powers. He cannot remain there, he must come down to earth again. At one time he passionately craves for and feels after a God whose ways are past finding out. At another his soul is overpowered with the flood of the divine light and goodness. You might describe some of his utterances as guesses at truth: e.g. he can find no promise on which to base his hopes of a future life. It seems to us that the prophets tread with a much calmer and firmer tread, and know far more clearly and surely than David Him in whom they have believed.

By the traditional theory the Psalter is predominantly David's. For David, Professor Cheyne substitutes the Jewish Church. He remarks: 'We can venture to say it is consciousness of the Church, or of some leading members of the Church, which finds a voice in every part of the Psalter' (p. 'It can be shown that in most cases, even when the psalmist uses the first person singular, the speaker is really either the Church or a typically pious Israelite' (p. 258). This is one of Professor Cheyne's staple arguments, and it demands very careful consideration from us. We fasten on the phrase 'consciousness of the Church,' and ask what it means. The old vexed question presents itself, What is the Church? We are not clear what Professor Cheyne means by the word. The conception of the Church, he says,1 'does not mean always quite the same thing in the Scriptures, at least in the earliest authority, the book of the Second Isaiah.' We think his own use also varies. We find such alternatives as 'the Church or some leading members of the Church,' 'the Church or a typically pious Israelite.' From these we should infer that by the consciousness of the Church he means the

1 Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism, p. 172.

VOL. XXXV.-NO. LXIX,

for

life

tia

ha

rel

ne

and

all

wh

of

act

Psa

bet

Tes

has

der

and

mu

wh

tea

goo

tea

wa

and

xii.

to

bre

Co

Isr

san

cer

mo

tha

wit

ten

and

mu

an

wil He

Ne

Det

(pp.

consciously formed knowledge or judgment of the Ecclesia docens, Israel's great teachers; not the same as formed by the nation at large, the average religious opinions or attainments of ordinary Israelites. He denies, however, the existence of a Jewish Church before the Exile (p. 199), draws an antithesis between a small circle and the Church nation, and uses the phrase (p. 148) 'Church within the Church.' So he must give the word a wider sense. It is apparently with him the body of faithful Israelites who are conscious of their high calling, those who have been awakened to a sense of their condition, and are hastening to prepare themselves for the acceptable year of the Lord. We must maintain in opposition to this that the Psalter can only be a product of the Ecclesia docens. It is not disciples, though they may be faithful, it is only teachers who can frame the Church's formularies, whether of faith or devotion. It is not in her infants but in her developed saints that the Church's consciousness finds her voice. The vox Ecclesiae, whether in faith or worship, has never been vox populi. The words of prayer and praise which the Church puts in her children's mouths, being at once a little above even the ideal of their aspirations, far too lofty and spiritual for their facile use, and utterly beyond their ordinary course of life, are indubitably beyond their capacity to frame.

An important consequence follows. It will be futile for us to search the historical books or the writings of the prophets, and having deduced from thence the actual condition of Israel as a whole, or even of her better part, infer the sort of devotional book she would use. This, it seems to us, is just what Professor Cheyne does. We might put his argument thus: the nation Israel before the Exile is in the first standard of religious attainments: it is absurd to suppose that she can have anything more than a first standard devotional book.2 We reply, her devotional book was as much above her religious level as the prophets were above ordinary Israelites. We should maintain, and we think Professor Cheyne would admit, that the prophets towered above the people in religious matters. The difficulty is to understand how the two were (but we know they were) contemporary members of the same nation. Israel's teachers must have been

<sup>1</sup> Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism, pp. 174, 177.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> It is worth while noticing that we should obtain utterly false results if we argued from the Danish incursions, the Wars of the Roses, or the ethos of the eighteenth century, to the devotional formularies in use at those times in the English Church!

Ecclesia ned by attaine existdraws nation, hurch. arently cious of a sense mselves ntain in duct of may be hurch's in her n's conin faith prayer mouths, rations,

beyond e for us rophets, of Israel f devost what nt thus: dard of she can book.2 ove her raelites. e would ople in now the nembers re been

utterly

se results es, or the in use at for many reasons infinitely further removed in faith and life from Israel's people than Christian teachers from Christian people. No part of the Old Testament scriptures can have been in free use before the Exile. Moreover, the Jewish religion was continually receiving fresh developments, so necessarily there would be more difference between teacher and scholar than in a religion whose faith has been once for all delivered. Do not all these considerations prove to us what a wide gap there may have been between Israel's book of devotion—the product of her ripened saints—and Israel's actual life?

But Professor Cheyne puts his argument thus. Psalms are Church Psalms, and there is no Jewish Church before the Exile (pp. 196, 258). If this be the case the Jewish prophets are inexplicable indeed. The critical theory has deprived them of all ancestors; it also, it would seem, deprives them of all children. Such teachers, following one another as they did in a continuous and long continued line, must have gathered round them a little flock of faithful ones, who assimilated to some extent their lofty and spiritual teaching, who would not bow the knee to Baal or any false god, and from whose ranks new teachers arose when the old teachers fell asleep. Leaders who can lead, we know, never want followers who can follow, and the prophets are fearless and noble leaders. Like the children of Issachar (I Chron. xii. 32) they were men that had understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do, and some at least of their brethren would be at their commandment. Put the Priest Code as late as you please, was there no common worship in Israel before the Exile? Assume that the law of the one sanctuary was not much earlier than Josiah, had not the central shrine at Jerusalem a pre-eminent dignity from Solomon's days? Meeting for common worship and a shrine like that of Jerusalem imply the existence of a Church. We grant, without demur, that the idea of a Church in Israel was extended manifoldly after the Exile. The Church made vigorous and rapid growth out of the ruins of the nation. But we must not confound an important epoch in the development of an institution with its birth. The Church which was in the wilderness with Moses never ceased to exist. The Church of Hezekiah or Josiah was inferior to the Church of Ezra and Nehemiah mainly in regard to the numbers included in her

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Professor Cheyne regards Isaiah and Jeremiah and the author of Deuteronomy as founders of the Jewish Church in idea but not in fact (pp. 209, 210).

of

al

in

OW

or

W

ca

in

H

for

me

Te

pre

the

ex

ne

It

bu

is

Ch

de

Ps

tru

of

COI

to

(p.

17: ha

(p.

tha

tha

(p.

cf.

are

Psa

mo

quo

bet

or o

of t

fold. We might, we think, just as truly say that there was no Christian Church before Constantine as that there was no

Jewish Church before the Exile.

We have argued hitherto on the assumption that Professor Cheyne's theory—the Psalms as a whole are Church Psalms—is true. But is this so? We have already seen that the difference between a Church Psalm and an individual Psalm is not so great as might be imagined. In all we find the expression of a saintly ideal, and the Church's mouthpiece in such matters is a ripened saint. But can all, or even the great majority of the Psalms, be regarded as essentially 'Church' in character? Such they have become by usage we know, but are they such also in original conception and purpose? We are quite ready to admit that the 'I' of the Psalms is often the national and not the individual 'I.' But is this predominantly the case, in the earlier as well as in the later books?

It is a well-known fact that the Psalmists, when apparently describing their own experiences or circumstances, or the glories and virtues of the Theocratic kingdom and king, use what some would call hyperbolical or extravagant language. Thus Ps. xxii. describes suffering which man never endured, resulting in a victory which man never won; Ps. xlv. a king of superhuman goodness and majesty; Ps. lxxii. a kingdom of supernatural beneficence and unnatural extent and duration. The ancient explanation of this was: the Psalmists, inspired by the Spirit of God, were raised above and beyond themselves, their time, their circumstances, and their nation, and used words which received their complete, sometimes their only fulfilment in Christ and His Church. In regard to this explanation we confess at once that it leaves much wholly unexplained. It does not explain what Inspiration is. does not profess to solve the psychological problem, how the Psalmist remained himself and yet was raised above himself. It does not even attempt to solve that insoluble problem which always arises when the Infinite and the Finite come together and co-operate. But the explanation has the one sufficient justification that it accounts for all the facts of the case. Psalmists' words receive literal and detailed fulfilment in the life and work of Christ, and in the history of the Church. To their descriptions and expectations, which are indeed bombastic and extravagant if you look to their own age, corresponds a reality which we Christians have seen more than fulfilled. Reading the Psalms we read the words of men, we recognize the thoughts and circumstances and hopes of Jews

ere was was no

Oct.

rofessor almshat the Psalm ind the piece in ven the entially sage we nd pur-Psalms is this ne later

parently or the ing, use nguage. endured, . a king ingdom uration. inspired themon, and es their to this wholly how the himself. m which together ufficient The it in the

ch. To ed bomge, corre than men, we of Jews

of a certain age. We do this, but we do more; we discern also truths and facts utterly beyond the mind of men living in such a time, and we acknowledge present Deity. For our own part we are satisfied with the old explanation. It coordinates the different facts, it acknowledges a mystery. Wisely it makes no attempt to answer the question, How

can these things be?

But Professor Cheyne does not believe that the Psalmists, in the strictest sense of the word, prophesy of Christ or of His Church, he rejects the old Messianic theory in its latest form (p. 261). He believes that the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies which New Testament writers find in New Testament facts or teachings, have their basis not in those prophecies but in the writers' imaginations.2 This being the case he has to find another explanation for 'the seeming extravagances of the Psalmists' (p. 261). It is not 'the connexion between the true Messiah and the Psalter' (p. 261). It is, 'that the Psalmists speak in general, not as individuals but in the name of the Church nation' (p. 261). 'The Psalter is a monument of Church consciousness' (p. 265). Professor Cheyne rejects the ancient Church theory, and with it he deprives himself of the historical reality, corresponding to the Psalmists' ideal description. The Psalmists' words have no true fulfilment unless it is found in Christ.3 The extravagance of their language may be mitigated by a theory of Church consciousness, but it is very far from being removed. He has to supplement it with remarks about anticipations not realized (p. 145), 'the haze of illusion which accompanies our poet' (p. 172): 'must not a lyric poet, sensitive to all national impulses, have been carried away on the full tide of national enthusiasm?' (p. 28), and the like. Spite of his protest we must maintain that under his theory we have numerous 'specimens of more than Persian or Mogul hyperbole and bombast' in the Psalms (p. 141).

<sup>1</sup> So we gather from p. 260, but see also on the contrary p. 239, and

<sup>3</sup> Professor Cheyne acknowledges in some sense a fulfilment in Christ of the Old Testament scriptures (*Devout Study of Criticism*, p. 175).

cf. Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism, p. 175.

We do not wish to misrepresent Professor Cheyne; his exact words are (p. 261): 'Nor do I, in rejecting the old Messianic theory even in its latest form, mean in the least to disparage the quotations from the Psalter in the New Testament. We are all conscious sometimes of moods when the past is nearer to us than the present, and when such quotations, imaginatively viewed, suggest a "pre-established harmony" between sacred poetry and not less sacred facts. The New Testament applications of the Psalter may not indeed be proofs either of doctrines or of facts, but they do prove the transforming power of the Gospel,' &c.

ac

hi

ar

nc

TI

ba

th

at

Si

th

vi

(p

fa

ne

hi

or

be

W

fa

it,

th

H

K

sa

fir

(F

m

na

fe

ar

es Pa

be

P

ch

th

in

26

Professor Cheyne's theory of 'Church' Psalms cannot be said to be recommended to our acceptance by the nobility of the meaning or of the fulfilment which it furnishes for the Psalmists' words. Illusion is a poor substitute for the transcending fulfilment which Christian teachers think they In his view the Psalmists' words are greater than perceive. the disappointing historical reality; in theirs the reality is infinitely greater than the words. But what positive evidence, we ask, does he adduce for his theory? He thinks it 'strange that it should be so uncongenial to English students, whose road to Jerusalem begins at Athens, and who know alike their Sophocles and Isaiah' (p. 262). 'Sophocles and Isaiah'in these words he indicates to us his two somewhat heterogeneous foundation-stones. He quotes a passage from the Edipus at Colonus, and asks whether it is not the Chorus personified which is the speaker. Then he turns to the 'Servant of Jehovah' of the second Isaiah, which in some passages obviously refers to the people of Israel. By the aid of the remark 'Have we not by this time learned that the Jews equally with their neighbours believed in the super-sensible existence of ideals (see Dan. vii. 13), such as Wisdom, Israel, Jerusalem, which could from time to time become visible?' (ib.), he is able to arrive at the cautiously-expressed conclusion that 'even in that strikingly individualistic description of Is. lii. 13-liii. 12, the writer may refer to the people of Israel, the heavenly ideal of which, formed (Is. xliv. 21) from eternity, is personalized by vivid imagination '(p. 263). He has now got two standing points for his feet-the one the Greek Chorus, somewhat remote, the other the nationalistic interpretation of Is. lii. 13liii. 12, somewhat uncertain. Remote or uncertain as they may be, they suffice for his purpose. His very next sentence is, 'Now, if the difficulties in the application of this theory have been overcome [the italics are ours] in the second Isaiah, why should they much longer prove obstinate in the Psalter?' (p. 263). Have been overcome; he only said 'may' in the previous sentence. All uncertainty has vanished, it appears. 'Let us then,' he goes on to say, 'courageously face them.' It seems to us that difficulties in the way of interpretation should not be treated like temptations; they should be allowed to have full weight, and should be set at defiance only to avoid difficulties still greater. Let the phrase pass, however. The next sentence (p. 263) is: 'In those parts of the Psalter which sound most distinctively individualistic let us recognize the voice sometimes of the suffering and sin-conscious or jubilant and forgiven people of Israel, sometimes of the self-forgetting poet, who

XUM

nnot be bility of for the he trannk they ter than eality is vidence. strange s, whose ke their saiah ' heterorom the rus per-Servant passages l of the equally xistence rusalem. e is able even in -liii. 12, nly ideal onalized standing mewhat . lii. 13as they sentence ory have ah, why ter?'(p. previous 'Let us It seems ould not have full fficulties sentence nd most

accepts his share of the experiences of his people.' Facing his difficulties it would appear they immediately vanish and are no more seen. Passages 'most distinctively individualistic' no longer stand in the way of a nationalistic interpretation. Though he has not done more than establish an à priori probability of his theory in some Psalms, he seems to imagine that he has demonstrated its truth in the places where it seems,

at first sight, most improbable.

Speaking of the collection of Psalms which he supposes Simon the Maccabee to have made, Professor Cheyne remarks that 'the older Psalms were found to be from a later point of view not in all points sufficiently adapted to congregational use' (p. 9). He thus acknowledges that the later psalms are, prima facie at least, more congregational. But primâ facie reasons never satisfy Professor Cheyne. It is quite a characteristic of his to explain away obvious facts. Thus Psalm cxxxvii., which one would have imagined was essentially exilic, is really Maccabean. 'A later temple-singer identifies himself by sympathy with his exiled predecessors' (pp. 69, 70). He never allows facts to stand in the way of a theory when he has once formed it, and so he comes to the conclusion that the earlier Psalms, though less self-evidently, are not less really 'Church' Psalms. His conclusion here may be contrasted with that of Professor Kirkpatrick, which seems to us much nearer the truth. He says:1 'Speaking broadly and generally the Psalms of the first division (Pss. 1-41) are personal, those of the second (Pss. 42-89) national, those of the third liturgical.' 2 We may think it of small importance whether the Psalms are national or individual, and the distinction as drawn by Professor Cheyne may seem to us to be infinitesimal. But it is an essential part of his proof that all the Psalms are postexilic. His argument runs thus: With but few exceptions the Psalms are 'Church' Psalms; there was no Jewish Church before the Exile; therefore all the Psalms are post-exilic.

Professor Cheyne maintains that the uniqueness of Israel's Psalms is a direct consequence of their national or Church character. 'Never were there such prayers and praises as those of Israel, precisely because in the Psalmists as such the individual consciousness was all but lost in the corporate' (pp. 264, 265). 'The religious poetry of Israel was fervent, just

1 The Psalms, bk. i. Introd. pp. xlii, xliii.

e some-

forgiven

et, who

<sup>2</sup> Note also Dr. Gaster, in a letter to the Academy, No. 1040, of April 9, 1892, maintains the somewhat startling theory that the Psalms of the first book differ from those of the last books, not in their date, but in their less general character. The Psalms of the last two books were those which were sung in the Temple and are now used in the Synagogues.

m

as

lit

be

tin

E

co

in

th

on

an

ha

E

lik

ur

0

sp

du

pe

no

ho

co

pa

th

th

qu

m

pa

PI

1x

WI

be

hi

W

la

to

W

ac

because its writers spoke for the community, having absorbed that passionate love of God and country which flowed in each of its members.' Now, is this psychologically true? Is a man most fervent when he speaks for others, even his Church or nation, or when he speaks for himself? Of course there is a contagion of devotion and enthusiasm. An isolated individual has not such deep feelings as the member of a community. It is the love which spends itself on others which burns most fiercely at home. Still our deepest, most passionate feelings must be individual, we think. knoweth its own bitterness, and a stranger doth not intermeddle with its joy. Close as the union between a man and his Church and nation may be, he cannot quite identify himself with either. The spiritual experiences of which the Psalter is so full must from the nature of the case be individual experiences. If idealized, as sometimes they are, the corresponding reality cannot be a supposed national, but an actually experienced personal feeling. Could anyone express in such passionate terms as those of David a national love for God? Could anyone confess the nation's sins with such an abandon of penitence and humility as we find in Psalm li.?

It is well worth noticing that the most essentially congregational Psalms, viz. those in books iv. and v., are least passionate. Moreover we have confessions of sin undoubtedly national and 'Church' in character in the books Ezra, Isaiah, and Daniel to compare with the confessions in the Psalms. Psalm li. is much more intense in its expressions of feeling than any of these. It is a heart's sob; they are rhetorical. It could be used from end to end by a penitent, and he would hardly wish to change, or give a symbolical meaning to, a single verse. They would only supply him with suitable sentences, and he would have to pass by much as unsuited to Could we have a more convincing proof that Psalm li. expresses in ideal reality an individual and personal experience? It is because the Psalms are the outpourings of individual souls that they can be so fitly used by individuals. We may derive a further argument from the fervid zeal of the earlier prophetical writings, when, according to Professor Cheyne, the Jewish Church did not exist. Why should we trace to the community passionate fervour of devotion when we acknowledge that a similar passionate fervour of exhortation is individual? Fervid speaking in God's name implies

equal fervid drawing nigh to God.

In a peculiar degree, we think, religious life in Israel was first individual and then national, and her religious developbsorbed in each ? Is a Church se there isolated er of a others st, most t internan and fy him-Psalter experionding lly exin such r God? bandon

Oct.

congrest pasabtedly Isaiah, Psalms. feeling torical. and he eaning uitable ited to of that ersonal ings of riduals. of the ofessor uld we when

chorta-

mplies

el was

evelop-

ment was first intensive then extensive. The Exile we regard as producing a great development in the Jewish Church, but little or no development in the Jewish religion. What had been previously the habits of the pious Jew became from that time onwards the national customs. At the return from the Exile the leaven of Judaism was in its essential elements complete; it had, however, done little as yet towards leavening the lump of the Jewish race. In the pre-exilic history the Israel indeed often seems almost to be concentrated in one man. It was not only Abraham whom God called alone and blessed and increased; Moses, Samuel, and David might have used with some truth Elijah's words and said, 'I, even I, only am left.' This state of things is reversed after the Exile. We have a numerous Church, but no great teachers like those of former days. The gain in extensity, as is not uncommonly the case, was accompanied by a loss in intensity. Our inference is that the most spiritual Psalms, as the most spiritual prophetical teaching, are pre-exilic and are individual rather than national.

There is an argument to which we have already referred, and of which Professor Cheyne makes constant use when the persons whom he supposes to be the subjects of Psalms do not correspond with their descriptions, or do not realize the hopes and expectations expressed concerning them. He accounts for this discrepancy between the actual history and his hypothesis about the Psalm by a theory of it on the part of the author. Thus, when he has implicitly admitted that the eulogistic words of Psalm cx. if referred to Simon the Maccabee overshoot their mark, he answers the consequent objection by saying that 'it appears to be certain from many prophetic passages that inspiration was not incompatible with some harmless illusion '(p. 28). The same theory is proposed to account for the previous failure of Ptolemy Philadelphus to realize the descriptions of Psalms xlv. and lxxii. (pp. 145-170). He did not turn out so well as the writers of those two Psalms expected.

Assuming for the moment the argument of 'Illusion' to be valid, we should take two objections to its use by Professor Cheyne. The first is put very well by Dr. Sharpe in his monograph on Psalm cx. (Psalm CX. p. 41). It is another way of saying that the theory partially breaks down. The language of the Psalm does not explain the facts which have to be explained. It does not fit the person or the time to which it is ascribed. The only evidence which Professor Cheyne admits is of an internal character. He veils its unsatisfactori-

me

Pt

rig

to

frie

na

ve

vir

im

the

H

Vi

illi

po

Je

ce

(p.

· E

co

of

me

for

rig

a

he

pe

of

th

th

pc

Pt

qu

Ps

ki

"tl

A

W

sic

ar

ca

de

SU

ness by a theory of illusion. We may ask with Dr. Sharpe, 'Is it not possible that it is the critic not the author of the Psalm who is under illusion?' Our second objection is that Professor Cheyne does not use the argument fairly. If true, it should be taken into account when he is arguing against the traditional theory about the author or subject of a Psalm as well as in arguing for his own idea. But this Professor Chevne forgets Why should not 'illusion' account for the reproachful utterances of Psalm xliv. if placed in the mouth of mourners for Josiah (p. 91)? 'Underneath the ideal glory of the picture [of Psalm lxxii.] we fail to trace the lineaments of the historical Solomon' (p. 142). Quite so. But if we substitute Ptolemy Philadelphus the words are equally true. Nay, had not a psalmist of Solomon's early years much more solid ground for his anticipations, whether in Divine promises or actual performances, than any psalmist of the early years of Ptolemy could possibly have? If illusion accounts for the gross exaggerations of the language of Psalm lxxii. regarded as a description of Ptolemy, why should it be ignored when the same language is suggested to be a description of Solomon?

But is the argument from illusion valid? Is it compatible with inspiration? We think it must be frankly admitted that some sort of illusion is not incompatible. But illusion is an ambiguous term; it admits of all kinds of degrees, from the mist or the sunlight which idealize to the fog or 'ignis fatuus' which distort and deceive. It arises from all causes wide asunder as heaven and hell. There is an illusion which comes from the overpowering fulness of the Divine Spirit; there is also an illusion which comes from the basest of motives, selflove, self-interest, the wiles of the devil. The eyes of the inspired teacher are opened to behold the truths of a world hitherto unseen and unknown. Naturally he sees men as trees, walking. He knows only in part and prophesies only in part, and illusion is an ordinary result of partial knowledge. He sees isolated from all surrounding circumstances a picture of glorious deliverance and triumphant goodness. Ways, means, times, and seasons are all hidden from him. His faith makes nothing of the difficulties, it annihilates time. Such illusions may be traced in many a prophetic picture and disappointed hope of the literal Israel, and they are indeed a common experience in the personal religious life of all saints. They come from the presence of the Divine Spirit, they are not only compatible with, but a consequence of His Inspiration. But the illusion of the baser sort—is it compatible with inspiration? We think not; but Professor Cheyne's argurpe, 'Is Psalm ofessor ould be ditional ell as in forgets oachful ourners picture storical tolemy not a und for al pertolemy s exaga dee same patible ed that sion is

om the fatuus' s wide comes here is es, selfof the world nen as es only wledge. picture Ways, is faith Such nd disideed a ley are nspira-

ole with

argu-

ment sometimes requires that it shall be. Psalm lxxii. invests Ptolemy Philadelphus and his kingdom with attributes of righteousness and world-wide beneficence which history fails to realize. The cause of the psalmist's illusion was Ptolemy's friendship towards the Jews and their religion. Gratitude for national favours is not a motive intrinsically base, but it is a very insufficient reason for crediting your patron with all the virtues. Inspiration, if there is any meaning in the word, implies deeper insight; gratitude for favours received warps the judgment. The case of Psalm xlv. is, however, much worse. Here, again, Ptolemy is said to be the subject of the Psalm. Virtues to which he has no claim are assigned him. Again, illusion on the part of the poet is the cause. But who is the poet? Professor Cheyne is able to inform us that it is the Jewish high priest 'who, upon the death of Simon I., succeeded to the προστασία instead of the legitimate heir Onias' (p. 170). He 'offered this encomium in return for his advancement to the civil and religious headship of his people' (p. 170). 'Blame him, if you will, for taking up the singing robes of a court poet, but acknowledge that it was a good way, not only of expressing gratitude, but of insinuating a pure religious morality'! (p. 172). To praise a king's righteousness in return for his bestowal upon you of an office to which you have no right, is indeed a remarkable and effective way of insinuating a pure religious morality. But note the cause of the illusion here. It is the gift that doth blind the eyes of the wise and pervert the words of the righteous (Deut. xvi. 19). Is this kind of illusion compatible with inspiration—Divine Inspiration that is to say?

Professor Cheyne's theory of illusion has led us to discuss the subject and occasion which he assigns to the very important Psalms xlv. and lxxii. His conclusion confers on Ptolemy—and he explicitly acknowledges this (p. 146)—a quasi-Messianic character. Ptolemy, as the subject of these two Psalms, is at once heir of Abraham's promises (Psalm lxxii. 8), sits on David's throne, and has succeeded to the Messianic kingdom. The author of Psalm lxxii. prayed that in him 'the Messianic promise might be visibly fulfilled' (p. 168). And yet Ptolemy is not of the chosen seed, nor is he even a worshipper of Jehovah. Psalm lxxii., forsooth, 'is an expression of early Jewish catholicity' (p. 147); Psalm xlv. of moral, and I may almost say, Christian optimism (p. 174). If so, the catholicity is of the latitudinarian type, and the optimism is devoid of wisdom. Professor Cheyne finds a much-needed support for his amazing conclusion in the books Ruth, Jonah,

vet

was

can

a v

to

cor

(p.

ow

and

cha

ti!

(p.

hir

Fu

fal

ye

cri

fee

in

mi

Ph

lik

CO

th

pe

tw

be

Sic

in

ne

ti

SI

T

W

W

us

us

P

ac

fo

and Malachi, all of which he ascribes to the same period, and which evince, he thinks, a similar catholic spirit on the part of the Jews (p. 146). What, we ask? Because a Moabitess (Ruth) was admitted into the covenant and became the ancestress of David's royal line; because a Jewish prophet (Jonah) was sent to a heathen nation, and the destruction he announced was averted on their true repentance; and because God's name was or would be great amongst the Gentiles (Mal. i. 11)—are we to infer that any of Israel's Psalmists would be ready to heap all their treasures of hopes and promises on the head of a heathen foreigner, and would thus renounce for themselves all which distinguished them from the nations of the world? In the kingdom over which Ptolemy was king there could be no need for keeping up the distinction between Jew and Gentile. When a Jew celebrated in song the apotheosis of Ptolemy, he was singing also the dirge of his own nation.

There were no doubt to be found in Israel after the Exile those who were latitudinarian in their feelings towards the Gentiles, and who imagined union and communion with them to be possible. It is, however, utterly inconceivable that they inspired the spirit and determined the policy of the nation. The political circumstances were such that it was only by emphasising and exaggerating the idea of separation that the Jewish nation was able to preserve itself in being. That the post-exilic Jews, as a body, were thus exceedingly and excessively exclusive, all the available evidence tends to prove. Jewish history, from Nehemiah to Christ, is obscure and fragmentary; but, whenever it becomes clear and definite, we find the exclusive party predominant. Ezra and Nehemiah were able to keep under the Jews who wished to intermarry with the heathen. The Khasidim (or strict Jews) under the Maccabees overcame, after a terrible struggle, the Hellenizers with the corrupt priesthood at their head, although the latter were supported by the armies of a great world-kingdom. Later still, though there were Sadducees and Herodians, it is the Pharisees who are the popular leaders, and embody the The Scribes are predominantly Pharisaic, national spirit. and it is under their direction that the canon of the Old Testament is formed. Under these circumstances, it is as irrational to suppose that the Jews would have willingly admitted a foreigner into the Holy of Holies as that they would have canonised a Psalm which made a heathen Gentile Abraham's and David's heir.1

<sup>1</sup> Professor Cheyne thinks (pp. 172, 173) the original occasion of

riod, and e part of s (Ruth) ncestress nah) was nounced e God's (Mal. i. vould be s on the unce for ations of as king between ng the

e of his e Exile irds the th them nat they nation. only by that the hat the excesprove. re and nite, we hemiah ermarry der the lenizers

e latter ngdom. ns, it is ody the arisaic, Testaational

itted a d have aham's

asion of

The full case against Ptolemy Philadelphus has not even yet been fully stated. As a ruler he was able, and his rule was peaceful and in many respects beneficent, but nothing can be said in favour of his private moral character. He led a voluptuous and dissolute life. He put two of his brothers to death. 'He violated the highest ideal of marriage more conspicuously than some of the better Oriental monarchs' (p. 168). In plain language he, though a Greek, married his own sister. At her death he built a temple in her honour, and worshipped her as a goddess. 'Do not make the personal character of Philadelphus an objection,' says Professor Cheyne; 'time could not as yet have revealed its darker aspects' (p. 170). Would, then, the inspiration of the Psalmist give him no help for the avoiding of such gross mistakes? Further, would a Psalm whose eulogies time had utterly falsified have been canonized? It seems a minor matter, yet it might by some be called a blunder worse than a crime, that the Psalmist addressed one who, because of his feebleness and sickliness, was unable to command his armies in person in the words, 'Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O mighty one.' 'In thy majesty ride on prosperously.' Ptolemy Philadelphus is, according to Professor Cheyne, the most likely post-exilic subject for Psalm xlv. and lxxii. Nothing could show more clearly the straits into which his theory that the Psalter is post-exilic-leads him. If we are compelled to turn to pre-exilic times to find a subject for these two Psalms, the theory utterly collapses. To prove them to be pre-exilic is to establish a similar presumption for a considerable portion of the Psalter.

Professor Cheyne believes he can discern a very large and important Maccabean element in the Psalter, and it will be necessary for us to examine his arguments on this crucial point. He argues somewhat precariously from the subscription to Psalm lxxii. that the Psalter consists of a number of small psalm collections, which were gradually enlarged. Then he considers Books iv. and v. together, and asks whether, taken, as a whole, they have any marked features which enable us to determine their date or dates. He gives us three—(a) 'The paucity of authors' names,' which shows us 'that the psalms of Books iv. and v. are not much older

Psalm xlv. was forgotten by the time of Simon the Maccabee, who adopted it into the Psalter. This would imply that Ptolemy's encomium was quietly accepted by all the Jews of the Greek period, i.e. that there were no Jews at that time filled with the spirit of Ezra and the Pharisees.

1 Professor Cheyne thinks the writer of Psalm xlv. was aware of this,

for he sees an allusion to it in Psalm xlv. 10.

is

wa

ab

rig

G

W

W

or

ar

01

th

m

in

in

re

ir

tl

h

I

tl

tl

than the collectors; '(b) 'the almost complete absence of musical phrases in the titles,' which shows 'that the Temple music had undergone a radical change in (or near) the time of the collectors;' and (c) 'the many distinct references to a congregational use of the Psalms,' which shows 'that the older Psalms were found to be, from a later point of view, not in all points sufficiently adapted '(p. 9) for that purpose. The inferences drawn are somewhat remarkable. By making the first Professor Cheyne inadvertently betrays his uncritical animus against anything of the nature of a title. A title is never, it would seem, prefixed to a Psalm until the origin of that Psalm is lost in obscurity. A Psalm writer is not without honour save in his own generation. A Psalm, it appears, must be anonymous at first; it must become established in the national use and affections for a few generations; then, and not till then, some one will arrive to embody the national verdict by ascribing it to some one marked out by tradition as a great writer of Psalms. It is such a good fiddle that it is only fair and right to inscribe on it 'Stradivarius fecit;' it is such a noble Psalm that it must be entitled a Psalm of David. Time, of course, is required for this process of canonization; you cannot give ancient names to Psalms whose authors are So (such is the argument) paucity of authors' names in a collection shows that that collection included many Psalms whose authors were as yet known, and which were therefore, as yet unfit to receive titles.

The second inference appears to be very precarious. We know nothing about the circumstances of these collections. Why should we argue from an absence of musical phrase to a change in style of music? A more natural deduction would surely be that these Psalms had not been set to music, or, rather, had not been musically edited. Suppose that the former collections had been taken from manuscripts used in the Temple, by the priests or the Levitical choir; this would account for the musical phrases. Suppose, also, that Books iv. and v. were taken from a manuscript intended for congregational use; this would account for their absence. We could not expect minute accuracy or consistency in the compilation of these collections of Psalms. They would certainly not be edited in the careful systematic manner of modern books. One hypothesis, accounting for differences of this sort, is only more plausible than another, and no hypothesis, however plausible, bears building upon as an established fact.1

To the third inference we make no serious objection. I

<sup>1</sup> This Professor Cheyne constantly forgets.

1892

sence of Temple he time ces to a hat the iew, not se. The ing the ncritical title is origin of without

appears, shed in ; then, national radition that it t; 'it is David.

ization; ors are names h were

s. We ections. rase to duction music, hat the used in s would ooks iv. ngregae could pilation

not be books. is only owever

on. It

is more than probable that the congregational use of Psalms was greatly developed in Israel in later times.

Professor Cheyne adds two internal characteristics to the The Psalms of Books iv. and v. are jubilant, and sometimes martial, in tone, and contain no doubts of God's righteousness. Admitting the facts, we should ask, Will Professor Cheyne undertake to say that doubts of God's righteousness had disappeared from Israelitish minds in the Greek period? Further, is it likely that expressions of them would be found in Psalms for congregational use? In other words, does their absence point to the date of the collection or to its purpose? Surely the latter is the simpler hypothesis,

and to be preferred.

Careful investigation seems to leave Professor Cheyne only one fundamental fact on which to base his theory as to the date of Books iv. and v.:- The collection was made specially for congregational use. Being such, it has not been musically edited; it contains few searchings of heart; it consists mostly of thanksgivings. The basis of fact is limited indeed; but mark the string of hypotheses which follows. From the absence of musical phrases, he argued, we saw, with insufficient reason, to a complete change in the Temple music, From the doubtful change he argues to an external impulse rendering the old music intolerable to cultivated ears. This impulse, he assumes, came from the Hellenic type of culture. The change in music was made (yet another assumption) by the anti-Hellenist leaders—the Maccabees, Judas and Simon. 'We may, nay we must, conjecture . . . . that Simon devoted himself to the reconstitution of the Temple psalmody.' 'What more natural than that he should follow the example of David, his prototype . . . . and make fresh regulations for the liturgical services of the sanctuary?' The 'prosaic' book of Maccabees tells us with poetical warmth how he made glorious the sanctuary and multiplied its vessels. 'Is it likely that he beautified the exterior . . . and took no thought for the greatest of the spiritual glories of the Temple, those "praises of Israel" which Jehovah was well pleased to inhabit?'1

'No; there cannot be another time so suitable for the editing of the two last books of the Psalter as this period of the Maccabean history. We have no ancient record of it [the italics are ours], and yet perhaps it is more deserving of credence than the story of the completion of the library of national records by Judas in the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The more obvious inference is, How eloquent the prosaic narrator would have waxed over the Psalms of Simon if only he had known

of

Vis

Ps

A

the

res

Ai

lar

it aff

ve

ass

be

ou

the

an

say

the

sta

inte

uni

ste

W

sta

suc

an

tha

yea

sup

Ma

car

thi

reg

COL

sta

the

ha

Ch

untrustworthy second book of Maccabees (2 Macc. ii. 14). Our result is that Books iv. and v. of the Psalter received their present form soon after B.C. 142' (pp. 11, 12).

There could be only one justification for a string of hypotheses like this—viz. that it was a hypothetical road from fact to fact. In reality we have here a pyramid of hypotheses based on the single and not very remarkable fact—Books iv. and v. are specially intended for congregational use. The change of music, the introduction of Greek music, the reconstitution of the Temple psalmody by Simon, these are hypotheses with no basis of fact. They are, nevertheless, more suo, hypotheses far more worthy of credence than ancient traditions, and on which we may securely build. When we put the one fact and the numerous hypotheses side by side, we can only say, 'O monstrous! but one halfpenny-worth of bread

to this intolerable deal of sack!'

Professor Cheyne having proved to his own satisfaction that Simon the Maccabee compiled the collection of Psalms which now make up Books iv. and v., proceeds to ask, 'Are there any groups of Psalms which are most easily explained on the theory of a Maccabean origin?' (p. 15). We may admit his contention that the Maccabean struggle was à priori likely to waken the spirit of sacred poetry in Israel. The question is whether Psalms then composed would be admitted into the Canonical collection. We are really unable to say on what principles the Canon was formed; why, for instance, the books Maccabees and Ecclesiasticus were excluded and the books Esther and Ecclesiastes were admitted. On, the critical theory the cause cannot have been the difference of date. That there were reasons for drawing the Canonical line somewhere may be assumed; it is quite conceivable that Maccabean Psalms may never or rarely have fulfilled the necessary conditions. Professor Cheyne argues that because the book Daniel (assumed Maccabean) was admitted, Maccabean Psalms would have been admitted also. The inference is hardly more plausible than because one book was, another book would be. It is surely best not to use à priori arguments on a matter of such obscurity. We are, on our part, quite willing to admit the possibility of Maccabean Psalms. The history of the Canon is too obscure for us to decide the question offhand.

But what are the criteria of Maccabean Psalms? We observe in passing that linguistic criteria are now regarded as indecisive. In olden times style differentiated between the earliest and latest books of the Old Testament generally, and

XUM

. Our present

hypoom fact otheses ooks iv. The econstiotheses re suo,

t tradiwe put ide, we f bread

Psalms k, 'Are ined on admit priori The lmitted to say istance, ccluded d. On, **Terence** cal line t Macnecesuse the cabean

another i arguur part,
Psalms.
ide the

ence is

rded as een the lly, and of the Psalms in particular. Scholars discerned a freshness, a vigour, a compression of thought, in the supposed earlier Psalms absent from the latter, which contained, moreover, Aramaic words and forms. Nowadays, Psalms which show the earliest linguistic signs-Psalms of the first book-are regarded as later than Psalms of Book v. which contain Aramaisms. We admit fully that the history of the Hebrew language is, from the paucity of evidence, obscure; and that it is possible to imagine late imitations of ancient models, affected archaisms and the like. Still there cannot but be a very considerable presupposition against a theory which assigns Psalms in the styles of early and of late Hebrew to substantially the same date, and also requires Psalms of the best style of Hebrew to be written when Hebrew was going out or had gone out of popular use. We can say no more; the history of the Hebrew language has yet to be written.

The dates of Psalms, nowadays, are determined by literary and, more especially, theological criteria. Professor Cheyne

says :-

'We may and must require that in typical Maccabean Psalms there should be some fairly distinct allusions to Maccabean circumstances; I mean expressions which lose half their meaning when interpreted of other times. And, above all, we expect to find a uniquely strong Church feeling, an intensity of monotheistic faith, and in the later Psalms an ardour of gratitude for some unexampled stepping forth of the one Lord Jehovah into history' (p. 16).

We observe Professor Cheyne says nothing about circumstances distinctive of the Maccabean times. That there were such circumstances he would readily allow. Can he produce anything distinctly Maccabean in the Psalms? We cannot see that he has done so. The critical researches of the last twenty years may forbid us to say now with Bishop Westcott, The supposition that the Psalter contains compositions of the Maccabean date is at variance with the best evidence, which can be obtained on the history of the Canon; that the Psalms regarded as Maccabean with the greatest show of reason contain nothing which could not be explained by the circumstances of earlier times, and do not contain much which, on the supposition of Maccabean origin, they would probably have contained.

The criteria of Maccabean Psalms, as stated by Professor Cheyne, cannot be regarded as conclusive. Is it not con-

1 Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, ii. 168. 1827 and

VOL. XXXV.-NO. LXIX.

0

be

po

ca

th

P

th

st

D

la

(S

us

us

qu

Ps If

be

W

m

ca

M

C

de

sh

W

lit

ce

ar

sp

sa

ye

po

V

A

ba

us

ceivable—nay, even probable, on the most naturalistic theory of prophecy—that a Psalm may be fulfilled in a far higher degree on a later occasion than that which originally called it forth? Professor Cheyne himself finds a consolation for the failures of the heroes of the Psalms to realise the optimistic descriptions of their panegyrists by the thought that their ideals were realized in the Messiah. And again, there was surely 'strong Church feeling' before the Maccabees. The Prophets imply it; Psalms which he ascribes to the Persian period express it. Was the Maccabean deliverance so unique in Israelitish history that we should find in Maccabean time a unique 'ardour of gratitude'? If it was so it is strange that the authors of Maccabean Psalms omitted all reference to the redemption which stirred the national being to its depths and spoke only of the wonders and redemptions of the olden time.\(^1\)

But we must let the criteria pass for the present, and watch Professor Cheyne at work with them. He applies them first to 'one of the more promising Psalms—the 118th'

(p. 16).

It is worth while pausing for a moment here to ask the question, Why does Professor Cheyne begin with Psalm cxviii. and not with Psalm xviii. We think we can discern the reason. If he had begun with Psalm xviii. he would have been hampered by the weight of external evidence assigning it to David. Here we may quote Professor Kirkpatrick 2:—

'The incorporation of Psalm xviii. in the Book of Samuel as a specimen of David's poetry illustrating his character and genius is the strongest evidence in favour of regarding David as the founder of the Psalter. That Psalm is there circumstantially ascribed to David, and there is no sufficient ground for placing the compilation of the Book of Samuel at so late a date that its evidence on this point can be set aside as a mere tradition which had sprung up in the course of centuries.'

And then he goes on to say-

'But if Psalm xviii. must be acknowledged to be the work of David, important consequences follow.' 'It has all the freshness of creative genius. It can hardly have been the solitary production of its author. If such a Psalm could have been written by David, so might many others.'

Professor Cheyne will not build upon a tradition, though ancient and solid; he prefers a critical hypothesis. He

2 The Psalms, bk. i. Introd. p. xxxiii.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Psalms of Solomon refer definitely and unmistakeably to the circumstances of their own times.

c theory r higher ly called n for the ptimistic tat their nere was es. The Persian o unique n time a nnge that rence to s depths he olden

Oct.

ent, and applies e 118th'

ask the m cxviii. cern the uld have assigning rick ":— nuel as a genius is founder cribed to

mpilation

e on this

ng up in

e work of eshness of ction of its d, so might

n, though esis. He

begins with the books in which the Psalms are predominantly post-exilic, and the traditions few and weak and late. He can throw over these later traditions with little difficulty, and then use them to discredit the earlier. By making late Psalms the origin of his investigations he contrives to change the centre of gravity of the Psalter to post-exilic times. Instead of saying with Professor Kirkpatrick, Psalm xviii. is David's, and so probably many others, he first establishes a late element in the Psalter, and then gradually detaches the (supposed earlier) Psalms from the pre-exilic period and from David. He pulls them over the line one by one, and then uses them to pull over the others. It is most instructive for us to observe what different results are arrived at as a consequence of the different fundamental and initial facts. If we accept certain Psalms as Davidic, it will follow that the Psalter as a whole is Davidic in tone and pre-exilic in date. If we prove certain Psalms to be Maccabean, we may soon be able to establish a presumption that no Psalms were written before the Exile. The moral seems to be that we must scrutinize with great care the first stages in the critical case—the evidence for what we may call the fundamental Maccabean Psalms.

Turning back to 'the promising' Psalm cxviii, Professor Cheyne says: 'The historical background is here singularly definite. Jehovah has interposed; he has avenged the death of his Khasidim; he has put down the idol-gods and their worshippers; friendless Israel has proved too strong for the whole world in arms' (p. 16). This, we should suppose, was a plain, literal, uncoloured sketch of the phenomena of the Psalm. Accepting it for the moment as such, we discern no elements which are distinctively Maccabean; nevertheless, the general correspondence with the Maccabean age is remarkable. Khasidim says Professor Cheyne, is a term 'not distinctively Maccabean; yet, taken in connexion with other exegetical phenomena which point to the Maccabean age, it steps at once into importance as an evidence of the first value' (p. 48).1 Further, the Maccabean struggle was definitely a struggle against idolatry. Vengeance was taken for the blood of the faithful whom Antiochus had slain; Israel overcame the world-powers in battle. A Maccabean date for a Psalm with such a historical background must be regarded as highly probable. But let us compare Professor Cheyne's sketch with the Psalm itself. 'Jehovah has interposed' is justified by many expressions. 'He has avenged the death of his Khasidim.' There is

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also p. 49, 'that distinctively [?] Maccabean term Khasidim.'

id

T

be

or

th

th

ar T

re

lis

th

th

It

po

th

M

Je

SF

ha

bu

SI

P

T

H

re

CC

sit

di

CU

be

ve

ui

P

lif

of

se

It

nothing about the death of any Israelite, nothing explicitly about vengeance of any kind,1 and, above all, the Maccabean word Khasidim does not occur in the Psalm. 'He has put down the idol-gods and their worshippers.' There is not a word about idols and idolaters. 'Friendless Israel has proved too strong for the whole world in arms.' This may pass, though it is more distinctively Maccabean than anything in the Psalm, which simply says, 'All nations compassed me about.' We see, then, that it is Professor Cheyne who has given the Maccabean colouring to the historical background. He has interpreted the expressions used from a Maccabean standpoint. He has shown us how appropriately it might have been used in the Maccabean struggle. To adapt his own words, he has practically rewritten it by an imaginative exegesis to suit the age of the Maccabees (p. 74). ordinate reasons which support him in his conclusion bear the same traces of unconscious colouring of the facts. It is quite unnecessary to suppose that the stone which the builders refused is the Asmonean family. How little distinctive are the words, 'Jehovah is God, and He hath given us light.' They could be paralleled from numerous earlier passages in the Old Testament. But Professor Cheyne says: 'Nor can I leave verse 27 unexplained; every line of it is significant. "Jehovah (not Zeus) is God; light hath He given us." May not this allude to the illumination which gave rise to the second name of the Dedication Festival (The Lights)?' (p. 17).

Such is the head corner-stone of Professor Cheyne's theory of the origin of the Psalter. Psalm cxviii. being proved (?) to be Maccabean, five other Psalms are, in consequence, Maccabean also, so the Maccabean nucleus of the Psalter is complete (pp. 18–50). It never seems to occur to Professor Cheyne that foundations which might bear a single stone would not bear a whole building. He constantly gives slight reasons which would incline us to believe that some result is probable or possible. He assumes the result as proved, and then makes some further more or less probable deductions, and so on. He does not seem to see that the last link of a long chain even of high probabilities is extremely

weak absolutely.

Psalm cxviii. and the group connected with it have little special interest or importance. None of them contain any teaching peculiar to themselves. Suppose them all Maccabean, suppose them all written in the Persian period, our

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cf. verse 7, however.

xplicitly ccabean has put is not a ael has his may nything ssed me who has ground. ccabean t might dapt his ginative he subon bear . It is builders tive are s light.' sages in Nor can nificant.

Oct.

ights)?'
Cheyne's
i. being
i. conseis of the
occur to
a single
ly gives
at some
esult as
probable
that the
tremely

May

to the

we little ain any Maccaiod, our idea of Israel at different stages of her development would scarcely be altered. This, however, is not true of all Psalms. To prove that Psalm cx. is Davidic or Maccabean is to have determined whether certain important theological ideas had been conceived in Israel's religious consciousness 1,000 or only 150 years before Christ. Nor can the importance of the date of the Psalm in regard to problems connected with the Person of Christ be minimized. The questions of date and theological significance should no doubt be kept separate. The conclusions to which sound and reverent and believing reason lead us should be accepted without misgiving. The light of God's truth can never cast a shadow on Him who is the Truth. Our interest in the date of Psalm cx. is nevertheless enhanced manifoldly by our Lord's use of it.

Psalm cx. is Maccabean, according to Professor Cheyne. It is almost beyond the limits of possibility that a Davidic poem waited for a public recognition till after the return from the Exile (p. 20). He labours to prove that Simon the Maccabee, who was at once ruler and high priest of the Jewish nation, was the priest-king of which the Psalm

speaks.1

Professor Cheyne's theory on the subject of Psalm cx. has received detailed criticism by Dr. Gifford and others; but we would call special attention to a monograph by Dr. Sharpe, which is full of valuable exegesis. Dr. Sharpe and Professor Cheyne belong to different schools of Hebraists. The latter's first thought when he meets a difficulty in any Hebrew passage is to propose an emendation. Dr. Sharpe regards emendations with horror, and is specially brilliant in construing difficult passages. He maintains, in detailed opposition to Professor Cheyne, the Davidic authorship and the direct Messianic interpretation of Psalm cx. The main difficulty in the minds of many in regard to the Davidic date has been that the theological ideas seem too advanced and developed for David's days. Dr. Sharpe will help such to understand how simply and naturally the imagery of the Psalm may be explained from the circumstances of David's Times beyond count David and his men had willingly offered themselves for the good of their nation! This fact served as the foundation for the ideal picture of the Psalm. It is no Aaronic priesthood to which the king is designated. The distinctive office of his priesthood is self-sacrifice, not

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The proof is, in our opinion, too weak to be substantially strengthened by the acrostic which Mr. Margoliouth has found in the Psalm. Cf. here *Academy*, Nos. 1034–1044.

le

w

CO

ex

do

ar

gr

as

D

ar

fir (p

Wa

an

01

gla

E

m

th

pc

th

ea

pa

cri

be

to

bu

on

an

as

pla

P.

alı

CO

un

co

wl

tra

of

the sacrifice of beasts; its qualification is holiness, not natural descent. Thus it is just the priesthood which a warrior, patriot, saint, king, could set before him as an ideal. Dr. Sharpe further suggests a very probable explanation for the fact that Psalm ex. (supposed Davidic) was hidden for so many generations from Israel's knowledge, and was not publicly recognised till the compilation of Book v. Nothing tends more effectually to retard the acceptance of a truth than its connexion in men's minds with error. It may well be that the advent of the idolatrous priest-king Jeroboam, Uzziah's sacrilegious attempt to take upon him the office of the Aaronic priesthood, and the like, caused Israel's teachers to lock up for hundreds of years a Psalm which described the royal and priestly offices as concentrated in one person.

We have already pointed out the bearing of the title of Psalm cx., supposed to be appended by Simon the Maccabee, on the Maccabean date and subject, and we must refer our readers to Dr. Sharpe's book for a detailed refutation of Professor Cheyne's arguments. One thing only we can say here. A comparison of the historical references in I Maccabees with the exalted language of the Psalm, is conclusive in our mind against the idea that Simon is its subject. No reasonable theory of illusion, no extravagances natural to a court poet could make the opening words of the Psalm, 'Jehovah saith to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool,' capable of being used of a temporary ruler and priest, the locum tenens which Simon The history utterly denies him that divine right which belongs to him in the Psalm. No Jewish poet would have dared to elevate the people's makeshift to the seat at God's right hand.

We believe Professor Cheyne's book to be an immediate and necessary inference from what may be called Wellhausen's theory of the Hexateuch and the earlier history of Israel. He may fairly claim to have put a top stone on that theory; in our opinion, it is foundation-stones which are specially needed. The question now rises—Is the assignment of a post-exilic date to the Psalter an element of strength or weakness in the general theory? Does it confirm, or does it rest upon the conclusions come to with respect to the Hexateuch? Professor Cheyne professes not to have assumed in his earlier lectures—those in which he determines the date of the Psalter—any date whatever for the Priest Code.\(^1\) This, in our opinion, is the most incomprehensible remark in a

<sup>1</sup> P. xxx, and also note b on p. 12.

ıatural

arrior,

. Dr.

for the

many

ublicly

tends

nan its

e that

zziah's

of the

ers to

ed the

itle of

cabee,

er our

ion of

in say

cabees

in our

eason-

court

hovah

make

of a

Simon

which

lhave

God's

ediate

usen's

Israel.

eory;

ecially

of a

th or

loes it

o the

sumed

This,

in a

1892

book which is full of hard sayings. It is hardly true to the letter, but it is, to our minds, utterly false in spirit. Everywhere, he seems to assume the general critical theory of the composition of the Old Testament books, in which the postexilic date of the Priest Code is a fundamental element. What does he mean by the phrases 'legislation of Ezra' (p. 196) and 'promulgation of the Law,' which he implies was the great work of Ezra? (p. 152). On what grounds does he assume that the only law in David's hands consisted of the Decalogue and the Book of the Covenant? (p. 237). What are his reasons for asserting that Hezekiah's age presents the first distinct germs of the religion of the post-Exile period (p. 101), and that the first Scripture was Deuteronomy, and was promulgated by Josiah? (pp. 91, 238). There is only one answer. He is assuming the truth of the critical theory of the Old Testament as a whole.2 And we can adduce a still more glaring case. How does he know that the two Divine names, Elyon and Shaddai, when they occur in a Psalm, are both marks of a late date? (pp. 73, 83). He must assume that the priestly document in Genesis is late, and indeed actually post-exilic.3 In the face of these facts, how can he assert that he does not assume the date of the Priestly Code in his earlier lectures? It would appear to be certain from many passages (we are adapting his own words), that to be 'a critic of fully adequate experience' is not incompatible with being possessed by some harmless illusions (pp. xi, 28).

Our conclusion is that the date Professor Cheyne assigns to the Psalter is not a confirmation of Wellhausen's theory, but a weight which it has to bear. The point is an important one. It is most difficult to determine what the critics assume, and what they prove. Our own impression is that their assumptions and their proved results on occasion change places.

Adequately to deal with Professor Cheyne's Origin of the Psalter would require a book as large as his own. We have already exceeded the limits of an ordinary article, and are conscious that many important points have been left wholly untouched. We can only ask in conclusion what are the consequences of accepting Professor Cheyne's theory as a whole? By that theory, as we have seen, the Psalms by tradition predominantly Davidic are assigned without a single

<sup>1</sup> See p. 236, with note.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cf. also pp. 51, 163, 194, for similar cases.

<sup>3 &#</sup>x27;Shaddai first appears in authoritative religious literature at the close of the Exile,' p. 124.

exception to post-exilic times. Jewish history, it appears, is, from beginning to end, a chapter of illusions. The prophets were utterly mistaken as to the methods of their own religious education and the past history of their nation, so also was the Church of the Exile and onwards as to the names and times of its sweet singers. A tradition, almost contemporaneous with the true (?) origin of the Psalter, misdated the Psalms by 500 or 700 years: i.e. Jews of the Persian or Greek period made the almost inconceivable error of imagining (or shall we say asserting?) Psalms composed in their own day to be already 500 or 700 years old.1 In consequence the Psalter is removed from a period of which we have considerable historical knowledge, and is consigned to one which must be called historically a dark age of the Jewish Church. It is separated from a period of advance and development and from a line of teachers of creative power, and consigned to a period when the chief teachers taught nothing on their own independent authority, and busied themselves with arranging, enforcing, and interpreting past teaching. The choicest product of the Old Testament Religion-its flower of sacred song-budded and blossomed when that religion was being fossilised. We can only adapt Professor Cheyne's words and exclaim, Believe it, who can! Further, the period after the Exile was predominantly legalistic and exclusive in its religious spirit; men like Ezra and Nehemiah, the Khasidim, and the Pharisees determine the national course. The Psalter, on the other hand, though not destitute of Psalms which indicate the rise of the legal spirit, is as a whole spiritual and catholic. The Psalms of David should be contrasted in these particulars with the Psalms of Solomon, which we know to belong to the later Maccabean period. Tradition marks out no great post-Exile History knows nothing of any Maccabean Psalm poet. writers. Tradition and history are alike disregarded because of the necessities of the critical theory of Israel's religious development. We decline to give up the ancient tradition of the composition of the Psalter, which, though no absolute demonstration of its truth can be given, is supported by many solid considerations and corresponds fairly with the

<sup>1</sup> We may quote here words of Dr. Liddon's (*The Worth of the Old Testament*, Preface, p. vii): 'It is difficult to understand how even in an uncivilized age a body of men like the Jewish Scribes and Rabbins could have come to think that a composition was a thousand years old, if it was in reality less than two hundred. People in England would have to be very uneducated indeed in order to imagine that a poem written in the days of Queen Anne was really of the days of Alfred the Great.'

gene critic

1892

and with resor

1. 7

A

3. 4

TH whi in t som vari rep cea but lan per the of nat is c his Au no

its

live

pas

and

be

for

dis

Oct.

s, is,

hets

ious

was

and

the

of d in

con-

we

one

vish

and

wer,

sied past leli-

hen

ro-

an!

zra

ine ugh

gal

of

the

iter

kile

ılm use

ous

ute

by

the

Old

an

fit

in

general historical circumstances. As against the modern critical theory, with its meagre positive support, its numerous and continuous assumptions, and its inherent probabilities, with its reckless repudiation of tradition and its constant resort to a theory of illusion, we claim that it holds the field.

## ART. VIII.—THE POETRY OF TO-DAY—AND TO-MORROW.

 The Shorter Poems of Robert Bridges. (London, 1890.)
 Achilles in Scyros. By ROBERT BRIDGES. Second Edition. (London, 1892.)

3. Love's Looking-Glass; a Volume of Poems. By H. C. BEECHING, J. W. MACKAIL, and J. B. B. NICHOLS. (London, 1891.)

4. The Book of the Rhymers' Club. (London, 1892.)

'THE poetry of earth is never dead;' but the poetry of man, which is in large measure only the poetry of earth as reflected in the more or less distorted mirror of man's perceptions, is sometimes dead, or nearly so, and is continually subject to variations in its strength and vitality. The poetry of earth repeats its music through the seasons year by year with unceasing regularity, constant in spite of its infinite variety; but the poetry of man may have its history marked off by languages and by periods, by its rise and its decay. Its periods of vigour and its periods of decline may be, indeed they assuredly are, closely connected with the varying power of men to appreciate and record the ever-present poetry of nature: but, however they are accounted for, their occurrence is certain, and is recognized in the ordinary phrases of literary history. We talk of the Elizabethan age of literature, of the Augustan age, of the Georgian or Revolutionary age; we may now talk of the Victorian age, no longer as that in which we live, and of which it is consequently difficult to form a dispassionate judgment, but as one of which the work is done and may be estimated, which stands on its achievements to be praised or to be condemned; and, finally, we may look forward to another age which shall succeed it in the near or distant future.

The history of English literature is marked throughout its course by a series of undulations, each representing the rise of a certain force or combination of forces, which works

itself up to its culmination and then declines. The court poetry of the Elizabethan age rose through Surrey and Wyat to Spenser, and declined through Cowley and Herbert, The dramatic poetry of the same age, akin yet different, rose through Peele and Marlowe to Shakespeare, and declined magnificently through Fletcher and Webster and Shirley. The circumstances of Milton's life place him somewhat outside the regular course of the development of English literature; but Dryden marks the summit of the reaction from the Puritan ascendency, while in the matter of technique and versification he is only a step in the way which leads on to Pope. Pope represents the climax of conventionalism in poetry, accompanied by the attainment of a perfect technical command of certain metrical effects; and he is followed in due course by the decline which works itself out through Tate and Pye. The next upheaval is reached less by development from the prevailing poetry of George II.'s reign than by a reaction from its whole drift and spirit, striving to substitute life and variety for a monotonous and unreal conven-The way is paved by Cowper and Burns; the summit is reached in the multifarious achievements of Wordsworth and Coleridge, Shelley and Keats, Scott and Byron, all the offspring of one spirit, working itself out in divers ways; and the inevitable decline followed in the third and fourth decades of the present century, in Alaric A. Watts and Felicia To this succeeded the fresh and vigorous out-Hemans. burst of poetry on which we now look back as the Victorian

We look back at it, although the Queen who gives it its name is happily still upon the throne, and the poet who has done most to mould its character has not ceased to write. But though Lord Tennyson has not ceased to write, and to write well, we cannot but feel that the record of his best work is closed, and the range of his genius finally determined. And though Lord Tennyson lives, many of those who were his contemporaries and friendly rivals are dead, and the others have apparently given us the best that they have to give. Browning, Matthew Arnold, Clough, Mrs. Browning, Rossetti, Newman are gone; Swinburne and William Morris have given us their best work, and no new poet has arisen yet to take their place. We have reached the inevitable period of decay, of pause, and, as it were, of marking time,

1892 and

of its
the
of a
ques
of th
more
with
larit
popu

on c

Clou Swin of the port the his lespen not is despen

deligiterizi versi preci artisi emii Bro consiboth

Lor

lect part Will trut unmay and tion

fron

acco

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Alas! this is no longer true. As these pages are passing through the press the news reaches us that he has 'crost the bar' (October 6).

Oct.

court

The

rose

lined

irley.

out-

tera-

from

and

on to

n in

nical

d in

ough

eve-

than

sub-

ven-

mit

orth

the

and

ades

licia

out-

rian

its

has

rite.

l to

ork

ned.

vere

the

e to

ing,

rris

isen

able

me,

ough ctoand may take stock of the work of the past generation, and of its influence on that which is passing.

The poetry of the Victorian age is neither precisely of the same character as that which preceded it, nor the result of any violent reaction. Its two leading names, beyond all question or controversy, are Tennyson and Browning; and of these there can be little doubt that the former represents more truly the general character of the period. Browning, with all his greater force and originality, with all the popularity which in his latter years he hardly won, has been less popular with readers in general, and has had less influence on contemporary poets. On the other hand, nearly all bear something of the mark of Tennyson. Matthew Arnold, Clough, Edwin Arnold, Lewis Morris, and to a less extent Swinburne and William Morris, testify to his influence; and of the lesser singers there are very few that have not raised a portion of their flowers from his seed. Tennyson, then, is the typical poet of the Victorian period, and he can trace his line in legitimate descent from the Georgian poets, and especially from Wordsworth and Keats. To Wordsworth not exclusively, but more than to any of his contemporaries is due the awakened insight into nature which is one of the special marks of nineteenth-century verse; and from Keats Lord Tennyson may have inherited a certain sensuous delight in beautiful things and beautiful words which characterizes the poetry of both, as well as the command of a blankverse style in which Milton is their only superior. And it is precisely these qualities, minute observance of nature and artistic elaboration of beauty in phrase, which are the preeminent characteristics of the poetry of the Victorian age. Browning has the first not less than Tennyson, though he is conspicuously wanting in the second. Matthew Arnold has both, tinged with his especial shade of reflection and intel-Swinburne has both, the love of language in lectuality. particular swelling out into excessive luxuriance of words. William Morris has both, with an archaism which strives after truth of expression by an avoidance of conventional and un-Saxon words. And the lesser poets, at whose head we may, it is to be hoped without offence, put Sir Edwin Arnold and Mr. Lewis Morris, owe their popularity to their cultivation of these two qualities, and might almost be classed according as they do or do not show taste in the cultivation.

It will be pleasant to illustrate this view by a quotation from one of the writers whose name stands at the head of this article. Mr. Robert Bridges may not be a poet of great

force or originality, but he possesses a delicate taste and a devotion to artistic finish which make him one of the most attractive of living writers of verse. The fastidious avoidance of anything like sensationalism or self-advertisement accounts for the slowness with which he has obtained public recognition: but the unanimous welcome given to his recent volume of Shorter Poems has carried his name beyond the narrow circle of personal friends and chance admirers into the general knowledge of the literary world. For delicacy of observation and refinement of expression he has no equal at the present day in English verse, though in prose he may find kindred spirits in Mr. Pater and Mr. Stevenson.

'There is a hill beside the silver Thames,
Shady with birch and beech and odorous pine:
And brilliant underfoot with thousand gems
Steeply the thickets to his floods decline.
Straight trees in every place
Their thick tops interlace,
And pendant branches trail their foliage fine
Upon his watery face.

'And on this side the island, where the pool Eddies away, are tangled mass on mass The water-weeds, that net the fishes cool, And scarce allow a narrow stream to pass; Where spreading crowfoot mars The drowning nenuphars, Waving the tassels of her silken grass Below her silver stars.

Sometimes an angler comes, and drops his hook Within its hidden depths, and 'gainst a tree Leaning his rod, reads in some pleasant book, Forgetting soon his pride of fishery;
And dreams, or falls asleep,
While curious fishes peep
About his nibbled bait, or scornfully
Dart off and rise and leap.'

Such delicate workmanship as this poem, which requires to be read at length to be fully appreciated, is not within the compass of everyone, but its spirit is the spirit of very much of Victorian literature, from the greatest to the least of its representatives. We recognize it in Lord Tennyson's

1892

in B

or

in I

or, Sw

clu and we

> the att

wr

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Robert Bridges' Shorter Poems, pp. 28-30.

or

Oct.

and a

most

woid-

ement

oublic

ecent

d the

cy of

ual at

find

uires

n the

nuch

ts re-

One willow over the river wept,
And shook the wave as the wind did sigh:
Above in the wind was the swallow,
Chasing itself at its own wild will,
And far through the marish green and still
The tangled water-courses slept,
Shot over with purple, and green, and yellow.'

## in Browning's

'all wildness,
No turf nor moss, for boughs and plants pave all,
And tongues of bank go shelving in the waters,
Where the pale-throated snake reclines his head,
And old grey stones lie making eddies there,
The wild mice cross them dry-shod.' 2

'The chapel and bridge are of stone alike, Blackish-grey and mostly wet; Cut hemp-stalks steep in the narrow dyke. See here again, how the lichens fret And the roots of the ivy strike.' 3

## in Matthew Arnold's

'sweet spring days,
With whitening hedges and uncrumpling fern,
And blue-bells trembling by the forest ways,
And scent of hay new-mown.' 4

or, finally, since some end must be put to quotations, in Swinburne's

'lower pools that see All their marges clothed all round With the innumerable lily, Whence the golden-girdled bee Flits through flowering rush to fret White or duskier violet.' <sup>5</sup>

Love of nature and study of its details are not the exclusive possession of the Victorian age. The pursuit of truth and beauty has led all ages to it in which truth and beauty were in any way regarded; and, to speak only of the examples which directly influenced our Victorian poets, the writers of the Revolution era were conspicuously inspired by the contemplation of nature. But there is a difference in the attitude of the two generations. Wordsworth, and those who followed him, were especially impressed by the influence of nature upon man, the thoughts and feelings to which natural

<sup>1</sup> The Dying Swan.

By the Fireside.
Atalanta in Calydon.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Pauline. <sup>4</sup> Thyrsis.

scenery gives rise in man, while the Victorian poets study nature more for its own sake, as a beautiful picture or a beautiful background to their actors. It is not for thoughts and inspirations, but merely for its intrinsic beauty, that they turn to it so often; and to a certain extent they do well. They have the taste to see the loveliness of the world, and they have the clearness of sight and truth of phrase necessary to render it in words, and no better setting to a work of poetical art need be asked for. Only there is a danger of forgetting that it is the setting and not the gem itself. Mere description of natural scenery, however true and beautiful, is not great poetry, any more than a mere reproduction of a landscape on canvas in colours, however accurate, is great painting. Art is not required to photograph nature, but to tinge it with thought, to bring it into relation with man, Mere descriptions of nature are studies for the picture, not the finished picture itself. Such studies have a very proper place in the early training of a poet, a fact which no one has seen and exemplified so well as Lord Tennyson, most of whose youthful poems (including The Dying Swan, quoted above) are studies of this kind, and the beneficial effects of such a training are evident everywhere throughout his mature writings. But it is one of the signs of the decay of a literary movement that the formal and technical part of its work continues to be studied and developed after the inner spirit of it has passed away, and is adopted by the generation which succeeds as itself the end and object of its art. Pope was not merely a verse-maker of unusual technical skill, he was also a rhetorician of the first order, and employed his mechanical improvement of the heroic couplet to give point and emphasis to the views which he had to express; his followers, lacking his rhetorical power, yet maintained the mechanical perfection Similarly the present generation of verseof his verse. writers is in danger of confining its efforts to what is in truth only the artistic medium of the great poets of the past generation, while that which the medium should express is not forthcoming.

It is not only in respect of the study of natural scenery that this tendency is visible in the poetry of the present generation. In every direction we find our poets limiting themselves to tentative efforts and studies instead of the great work to which these should lead. The vigour and inspiration seem to be lacking which should prompt the production of poetry on the grand scale, and consequently we have most of the younger poets spending their time in elaborating slight 1892 ske

> a si pres but one The triv poe of i poe The

is to spe son doe more before matthe

pre

rep

Sw

tru

It i

Bu

sketches—records of a single thought, a single impression, or study a single landscape. The workmanship is often good, the exor a ughts pression poetical, the music of the words carefully studied, but the impression which recurs more and more strongly as t they well. one reads is that the same thing has been done better before. The thoughts embodied in the verse are often trivial, but l, and triviality in the matter of a poem may be forgiven in a young essarv poet if the manner of his utterance shows signs of originality, rk of of individuality, of strength. And this is where our younger ger of Mere poets seem to fail. We say this, of course, with reserves. The quantity of new verse, and even of verse which wins a ful, is favourable word from the reviewers, which appears each year of a is too great for anyone to read it all, unless he makes it his great special study. Hence it is possible that one may overlook ut to some exceptions to the general rule; on the other hand, it man. does not seem probable, since strenuous originality, such as is ot the most likely to mark the rising poet of real genius, is almost place sure to attract notice, even though it be unfavourable notice, seen before long. The first volumes of Keats and Tennyson were vhose not favourably received by the critics, but at least they were bove) made the subject of detailed criticism, which gave the public ich a the opportunity of making acquaintance with them. ature is no sign in the literary reviews at this moment of the erary presence among us of a new force in poetry. Rather it is the conrepetition of the old themes of Tennyson or, still more, of of it Swinburne, of Rossetti, of Matthew Arnold-well done, it is which true, but still old. as not

They say so even themselves:

'Ours are the echoes at least That fell from that golden prime; Ours are the echoes at least, Ours are the crumbs from the feast At the feet of the queenly rhyme.' 1

It is true that the poem proceeds:

'Ours be the task to prolong The joy and the sorrow of song In the mist of years that begrime; In the clinging mist of the years, With reverent toil and with tears, To hammer the golden rhyme, Hammer the ringing rhyme Till the mad world hears.'2

But it is not echoes that will make the mad world hear. listens for an original music.

s also

inical

hasis

cking

ection

rersetruth

past

ess is

enery

esent

niting

great

spira-

ction

most

slight

<sup>1</sup> The Book of the Rhymers' Club, p. 93.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Ibid. p. 94.

of

be

liv

go

pre

ma

pe

the

his

rec

M

Bu

mi

the

ha

Th

Er

de

de

an

scl

fai

de

fic

Br

rh

Ce

ev

Μ

wi

av

di

bu

of

re

th

A

cla

W

W

ar

re

If we look back over the Victorian age, we see in it two poets of the first rank, who are sure of a place in literary history so long as English literature is valued-Tennyson and Browning; and five at least who are real poets, possessing the decisive mark of originality-Swinburne, Matthew Arnold, Rossetti, Clough, and William Morris. There are many others who have made excellent use of a music which was not altogether their own. Sir Edwin Arnold, Mrs. Browning, Mr. Alfred Austin, Mr. Lewis Morris, are among the most eminent of these, and it is only a most rigid test that excludes them from the class of original poets. not that they have consciously borrowed the methods or the phrases of others, but merely that they do not seem to have the force of character and inspiration which carries a poet clear of the influences which surround him, the general tone of thought and expression which are the literary data of the Every age has such poets, who do a very great work in spreading the love for poetry, which is the salt of intellectual life, through all classes of readers; but the Victorian age has been particularly rich in them. We cannot equal the age of George III. in the number of poets who rank definitely among the immortals. They may count six at least to our two, but of poets of the second order we have far the finer array. Of the seven poets of our age, however, named above, four are dead, and three, though living, belong to the generation which is passing away; and who among the rising generation is likely to replace them, and what will be the character of the newer poetry?

It is because these are the questions which interest us at the moment that the selection of volumes which stand at the head of this article is what it is. One might have placed there poems, published within this present year, written by Lord Tennyson and Mr. Swinburne; but they could tell us nothing that we do not know already, and we should turn to volumes published twenty and thirty or forty years since, if we wish to see the highest expression of their genius. We might have selected recent poems by Sir Edwin Arnold and Mr. Lewis Morris; but we doubt if we do these eminent writers wrong by supposing that the range of their genius has already been declared to the world, and that they stand or fall by works already so well known that it would be impertinence to dwell upon them at length, The Light of Asia and The Epic of Hades. There is more of the unknown, and more, therefore, of the possible, in the writings of Mr. Robert Bridges, who may stand for the poets of to-day, or in those Oct.

t two

erary

yson

ssess.

thew

e are

vhich

Mrs.

mong

d test

It is

r the

have

poet

tone

f the

ctual

e has

ge of

nitely

o our

finer

bove,

rising

us at

t the

laced

n by

ell us

rn to

ice, if

d and

inent

is has

nd or

e im-

Asia

, and

obert

those

We

the

of the younger authors of the other two volumes, who should be among the poets of to-morrow.

As has been said above in other phrases, we are to-day living chiefly on the past, gathering up and tasting again the good things which our fathers have left us. Mr. Bridges represents this feature in its best and most attractive form. many respects he is related to the poets of the Elizabethan period. His plays are partly on the models supplied by them, coloured, however, both in subject and in thought by his familiarity with classical literature; and his shorter poems recall, by their simplicity and their beauty, the lyrics which Mr. Bullen has rescued from the Elizabethan song-books. But the whole of his work bears signs of laborious polish, of minute care, which are foreign to the Elizabethans and are the special mark of our own age. Careful and conscious art has replaced spontaneous and apparently unstudied beauty. The change is not all loss; indeed, in this age of newspaper English, of rapid slipshod writing, it is refreshing to find one department of literature which stands outside this turmoil and deliberately sets its face backward, to draw its inspiration from an earlier and a quieter generation. Mr. Bridges is quiet, scholarly, refined, graceful, and these are qualities which go far to form a substitute for strength and originality. One defect in technique must, however, be noted-namely, a deficient ear for metre, unless we are to suppose that Mr. Bridges deliberately avoids the music which is to be found in rhythmical syllables and the swinging cadences of metre. Certainly his rhythms, as a rule, move slowly, and sometimes even awkwardly, recalling certain portions of the work of Matthew Arnold. It is a characteristic quite in accordance with Mr. Bridges' refined fastidiousness, which leads him to avoid high colours or sensational language: but it is a little disappointing to the ear trained upon Tennyson and Swinburne.

In spite of this defect Mr. Bridges is a true poet, and one of the unobtrusive kind, whose work gains upon careful and repeated reading. At the same time one fails to find in him the originative force which marks the poet of a new school. And the same must be said of the other writers who may be classed as belonging to the present generation, the men now in middle age, whose styles are formed and their characteristic work given to the world. Much has been written by them which well repays reading, much which expresses in cultivated and even beautiful verse the thoughts which each generation requires to have re-expressed in its own language; but we

VOL. XXXV.-NO. LXIX.

find little indeed among their writings in which thoughts have been expressed once for all and established as part of the heritage of English literature. Moreover, the beauties of their verse look backwards, not forwards. They are the development of the styles which have been formed by the greater poets of the preceding generation. They are the crowds of lesser lights which surround and repeat the glory of the stars of the first magnitude. We do not in the least mean that they are therefore to be despised and neglected, any more than it is wise to overlook the lesser Elizabethan poets because they are not the equals of Shakespeare or Jonson; but it is not to them that we must look if we wish to forecast the

poetry of the future.

One turns naturally to the writers whose powers have not yet matured, to the young poets who are still only learning to use their wings. For this purpose one can do little more than select at random among the better of the volumes of verse which appear with considerable frequency from the The two which we have chosen have the advantage of bringing together the work of a large number of young writers. Love's Looking Glass contains the verses of three Oxford poets, many of them first published in 1883, and now reprinted and amplified, while The Book of the Rhymers' Club is the work of no less than twelve hands, some of them already slightly known in the literary world, others entirely new to it, but all apparently serious students in the school of letters, and all with their ways yet to make. These should, at least, give us some insight into the ideas and aspirations of the generation in whose hands the reputation of English poetry will rest for some years to come.

Both volumes are pleasant to read. Both are cultured, harmonious, and in good taste. But the academic volume, if it may so be called, bears more of the signs of the amateur. The verses in it are plainly written by men with real poetic feelings and with considerable powers of expression in metre; but one does not feel as if metre was their natural and inevitable vehicle of expression. They write verses because it is a pleasant amusement to put into rhythm casual reflections, casual traits of beauty which cross their paths. The best poems are those which have a frankly academic character, such as Mr. Mackail's 'Nausicaa' and 'The Return of Ulysses,' for these have an individuality as products of the genius loci, being full of classical reminiscence, of classical thought and phrase. These particular poems are too long to quote; but as a specimen of the workmanship of the volume we may

give Mr. Nichols's sonnet on the bust of Caligula at the Capitol:

Being in torment, how should he be still? The slim neck twists; the eyes beneath the wide Bent Claudian brows shrink proud and terrified; Along the beardless cheek the muscles thrill Like smitten lutestrings. Can no strength of will Silence this presence ever at his side, This hateful voice, that will not be denied, That talks with him, and mutters 'kill' and 'kill'?

O dust and shade, O dazed and fighting brain, O dead old world that shuddered on his nod, Only this iron stone endures; and thence Looks forth a soul in everlasting pain, The ghost of Cæsar, maniac and god, And loathes the weakness of omnipotence.'

This is fine verse, excellent verse for an undergraduate or young graduate; but even here, and still more in most of the poems of this volume, one is conscious of a certain lack of seriousness—not in the thought itself, but in the use of poetry. Verse-making is play to these writers, a game which they play very well, but not the purpose of their lives. Hence their verses give pleasure, but contain no promise of great work in the future.

With the other volume under consideration it is different. Its atmosphere is metropolitan, not academic, and although there is plenty in it which denotes immaturity, there is yet about it a tone of serious and sincere purpose. We may be mistaken, but several of the writers impress one as being earnestly devoted to literature, a devotion which should bear good fruit, though not necessarily in verse, hereafter. writing of verse is a good apprenticeship to the composition of literary prose, and it may be that more than one of these young authors will do their best work outside the trammels of The verse-work is good, the thoughts generally true and occasionally somewhat new, and the language usually natural, poetical, and unexaggerated: the latter a feature especially remarkable in youthful and inevitably self-conscious work. At the same time there is nothing in the volume which contains any definite promise, or more than the mere possibility, of great poetic achievement in the future. The lessons of past literature have been learned; there is much earnestness, probably much real pains, but the note of distinction, of originality, is wanting. The scale, moreover, is very small; it is cameo-carving, not sculpture, and in a great work

XUM

s have
of the
their
relopreater
ds of
stars
that
more
cause

t the e not ming more es of the ge of iters.

t it is

inted s the eady to it, tters, east, f the petry

ared, ne, if teur. cetic etre; l inse it ions, best cter, sees,' loci, and

but

may

of art, as Aristotle taught long ago, the element of size must not be absent. It may be said that these are but preludings, specimens of the self-training in composition by which the poet, however great his natural genius, must learn his trade. But we doubt very much whether these writers are below the age at which great poets have generally shown some real and decisive promise of great work. The Shepherd's Calendar was published when Spenser was twenty-seven, Comus when Milton was twenty-six, The Rape of the Lock when Pope was twenty-four, Tintern Abbey when Wordsworth was twenty-seven, The Ancient Mariner when Coleridge was twenty-five. Marlowe, Byron, Shelley, and Keats had all made a permanent mark

on English literature by the age of twenty-four.

One feature is worth noticing, which is characteristic of most of the poetry of to-day, and which marks the larger, and certainly the better, portion of the poems of this volume. This is the gravity of tone which pervades them, a gravity which is distinct from the seriousness of poetic purpose already noted, and belongs to the thought rather than to the style. light and only half-serious manner has generally been characteristic of young poets; the emotions expressed might be passionate enough, but they were understood not to be more than skin-deep. The young poets of to-day seem imbued with a seriousness which is not, as might reasonably be suspected, mere affectation. Neither is it pessimism, which is almost always affectation, except when it is indigestion. It is simply a habit of thinking seriously, of allowing the mind to dwell upon grave topics. Of course there is sometimes exaggeration, sometimes even insincerity, in this seriousness, the former, at any rate, being the natural concomitant of immaturity; but the basis of it is sincere and genuine. It is partly an inheritance from Matthew Arnold, partly the result of the same causes that produced it in Matthew Arnold him-The conditions of modern life are serious enough. self. Serious thoughts, in philosophy, in politics, in social matters, in religion, surround us all from schooldays onward. minds pass them over, some play with them because they are fashionable, some are touched by them, it may be lightly, it may be deeply. But even a light acquaintance with them, if it be genuine, may be sufficient to colour poetry; and this will account for the general tone of contemporary verse, where there are no special circumstances, as in the case of Philip Marston, that 'inheritor of unfulfilled renown,' to justify a real melancholy.

One or two more quotations may be pardoned, in illus-

tration of this feature in the better work of the 'Rhymers' and their contemporaries.

Mr. Ernest Dowson has a poem on the 'Carmelite Nuns of the Perpetual Adoration':

- 'Calm, sad, secure; behind high convent walls,
  These watch the sacred lamp, these watch and pray,
  And it is one with them, when evening falls;
  And one with them, the cold return of day.
- 'These heed not time: their nights and days they make Into a long, returning rosary, Whereon their lives are threaded for Christ's sake: Meekness and vigilance and chastity.
- 'Outside, the world is wild and passionate;
  Man's weary laughter and his sick despair
  Entreat at their impenetrable gate:
  They heed no voices in their dream of prayer.
- 'And there they rest; they have serene insight Of the illuminating dawn to be; Mary's sweet star dispels for them the night, The proper darkness of humanity.
- Calm, sad, serene; with faces worn and mild: Surely their choice of vigil is the best? Yea! for our roses fade, the world is wild; But there, beside the altar, there is rest.'1

The thought here is obvious enough, and far from new; but the seriousness is neither forced nor exaggerated. A rather stronger poem is that entitled 'The Last Music,' by Mr. Lionel Johnson:

- Galmly, breathe calmly all your music, maids!

  Breathe a calm music over my dead queen.

  All your lives long, you have nor heard nor seen Fairer than she, whose hair in sombre braids

  With beauty overshades

  Her brow broad and serene.
- 'Maidens! make a low music: merely make Silence a melody, no more. This day She travels down a pale and lonely way: Now, for a gentle comfort, let her take Such music, for her sake As mourning love can play.

Oct.

nust

ngs,

the

ade.

the

and

was

lton

nty-

The

we,

ark

c of

ger,

me.

rity

ady A

ac-

be

ore

ued

be

ich

on.

ind nes

ess,

m-

t is

ult

m-

gh.

ers,

me

are, it

, if

his

ere

lip

a

15-

<sup>1</sup> The Book of the Rhymers' Club, p. 10.

man

shou

able

the

Kea

tem

the

oth

tha

his

wit

he

poe

Th

Bro

nev

he

Ne

po

for

sin

A

sp

th

rai

ge

of

be

ce

pe

ev

bo

la

It

ir

is

I

S

tl

F

'Holy my queen lies in the arms of death:
Music moves over her still face, and I
Lean breathing love over her. She will lie
In earth thus calmly, under the wind's breath:
The twilight wind that saith:
Rest! worthy found, to die.'

There is much here that reminds us of Matthew Arnold; and though Matthew Arnold was not quite in the first rank of poets, we should be glad indeed to think that Mr. Johnson

might in time become such another as he.

But, indeed, it is not easy to prophesy the future, either of these individual writers or of English poetry in general. That there is a pause in its progress at present will hardly be questioned; that it has other periods of efflorescence before it need be questioned as little; but what form that efflorescence will take may be questioned indeed, but will hardly be answered. Too much depends on the idiosyncrasies of individual genius for it to be possible to calculate the future with any confidence. When a poet has appeared, it is easy enough to trace his relation to his predecessors, and show how he developed out of them, whether by way of continuation or by contrast. But beforehand either method is possible. He may follow his predecessors either as Wordsworth followed Pope, or as Tennyson followed Wordsworth. The only hope is to try to discern what particular poetical methods have been worked out, and may therefore be expected to disappear, or at least to take a subordinate position.

It is only in relation to the themes and forms of poetry that prediction is even remotely possible. The amount and quality of the inspiration of the unborn poet are beyond the powers of calculation. They cannot be handed on from master to pupil. Pope could teach his followers how to write the heroic couplet; Wordsworth could turn the taste of poets towards natural scenery; Scott could teach Byron the manner of narrative verse; but in every case the extent to which the lesson was carried out depended on the genius of the individual writer. So it is to-day, and will be to-morrow. Tennyson has, on the whole, dominated the verse of the Victorian age; but it is Tennyson's technique, not his genius, that is communicable. It is to his example that we ascribe the prevalence of the characteristics attributed at the beginning of this article to the poetry of this age—artistic handling of language and delight in depicting minute details of natural scenery. These methods, which have already at times become

1 The Book of the Rhymers' Club, p. 48.

XUM

old:

rank

nson

ither

eral.

y be

efore

efflo-

rdly

s of

ture

easy

how

n or

may

ope,

s to

een r, or

etry

and

the

rom

rite

oets

ner

the

ıdi-

ny-

ian

t is

the

ing

of

iral

me

mannerisms, may be expected to pass away. The lesson should have been learnt, and these features of poetry, admirable as they are, are likely to take a less prominent place in the poetry of the future. The impulse which began with Keats and Wordsworth (though shared in part by their contemporaries) may be expected to have exhausted itself, and the development of our poetry should work itself out on other lines.

We have spoken little in this article of Browning, and that although he was the greatest force among the poets of his generation, with the most far-reaching imagination, and with infinitely the greatest dramatic insight. Among readers he has far more devoted admirers than Tennyson; but among poets he has far fewer followers, and for a sufficient reason. The passion of this generation is for form, and in form Browning was greatly inferior to his rival. His influence can never be that of Spenser, of Pope, of Keats, of Tennyson: he can never leave a mark on the technique of English verse. Nevertheless, he may exercise a very real influence on the poetry of the coming generation—on its spirit, if not upon its form. In him the dramatic faculty, dormant in English verse since the close of the Elizabethan period, rose again to vigour. And there are reasons why the dramatic spirit, or at least the spirit of distinctively human interest, should be prominent in the poetry of the future. The social surroundings of a generation react on its poetry; and the social surroundings of the generation now beginning active life promise to be very full of human interest. The lower orders in the social scale are becoming articulate, as they have not been articulate for centuries; and as they gain education and thought and independence, so they become more individual. The truth that every man has a soul to be saved, a mind to be taught, a body to be cared for, is being brought home to the world at large, not as an abstract proposition, but as a concrete fact. It may be that the sense of a common humanity will be the influence that will inspire the coming poet; though even so it is impossible to predict what form his inspiration may take. It may be actual drama, as it was in the great days of the stirring of the nation, three centuries ago. Or it may take the form of narrative, of a narrative in which characterization plays a part not less important than the actual story-telling.

It is often held that the day of the epic, or long narrative poetry, is over—that epics are for simple ages, and are unsuited to the complex conditions of modern life. It is not easy to see on what basis this notion rests. Whatever be the

exact nature of the merits of the Eneid, it can hardly be denied that it is both great and an epic; and yet the conditions under which it was produced were as complex, as artificial, as full of self-consciousness, as those under which we live. Neither was the Divina Commedia, nor yet Paradise Lost, written for altogether simple hearers. And to come down to our own days, the passion for the novel is a sure sign that the love of a story has not passed away. The instantaneous and universal success of Scott's poems shows that the nineteenth century is not too old to delight in narrative poetry, as the success of stories like Treasure Island shows the love of prose narrative to-day. Yet our leading poets have distinctly avoided the long narrative poem, and prefer the dramatic study, the single sketch, or the lyric. The Idylls of the King is a series of semi-detached episodes, The Ring and the Book a series of dramatic monologues. Mr. William Morris is the only real story-teller among the Victorian poets; and Sigurd the Volsung is a sufficient proof that a good narrative poem can still be written. The popularity of The Light of Asia, again, shows that there is vitality in the epic form. Only let a poet arise filled with the dramatic insight into humanity which underlies the best narrative, sharing the human enthusiasm which is in the air to-day, and will be more in the air to-morrow, and at the same time skilled in the technical knowledge of his art, and we may still have an epic which will rank with the great epics of the world. Let the right story be told, with the right spirit and the right art, and the world, complex and civilized though it be, will listen fast enough.

When the new age of poetry will come, or which of us will be alive to see it, it is impossible to say. It may be on the threshold now; it may be barely on the horizon. The new poet may be sending his manuscript to the printers, or he may be playing with his coral in his cradle. But meanwhile we have little to complain of, and no cause at all for pessimism. Every age requires to have its thoughts expressed in verse; but we have not yet outgrown the methods of expression which we find in Tennyson and Browning, in Matthew Arnold and Clough, in Swinburne and Rossetti. We could still find a Laureate, if need were, worthy to succeed the holders of the office during the present century. Our poetry, if it has lost for the moment the highest inspiration, has not lost either life or earnestness. It has not reached the empty repetition of stereotyped forms which marked the Roman decadence, nor the weary-eyed melancholy of the Greek. There is much

that very tion hum avera has

1892

would time at or will are Char

need even Milt

1. F

AR

2. C 3. F

EVE

a pa

ing are sup plis the that more determined.

citiz

ly be

ondi-

arti-

h we

adise

come

sure

The

hows arra-

sland

poets

r the

lls of

and

orris and

ative

Asia.

y let inity thu-

e air nical

hich right

the

fast

f us

the poet

y be

nave

ism.

rse;

sion

nold

find

s of

has

ther

tion

nce,

uch

that is prosaic in the surroundings in which we live, but the very prose of them drives us to look elsewhere for gratification of the non-prosaic element which exists in nearly every human soul. Since the days of the Elizabethans the general average of poetic merit has never been so high, and never has there been a public more appreciative of good poetry, more eager to find it, more ready to listen to those who would show it the way. It may follow false leaders for a time, it may be dazzled by temporary brilliance, it may not at once recognize the true poetry, if it be very new; but it will be quick to receive and welcome it when once its eyes are open. After five centuries of great literary life since Chaucer, we

'who speak the tongue Which Shakespeare spoke, the faith and manners hold Which Milton held,'

need not despair of seeing new poets who shall be worthy even of the company which walks with Shakespeare and with Milton.

## ART. IX.-THE GROWTH OF EDUCATION AND CRIME.

- 1. Reports of the Committee of Council on Education. (London, 1870-1891.)
- 2. Criminal Statistics. (London, 1870-1890.)
- 3. Report of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. (London, 1891.)

EVERY year when the Education estimates are voted there is a parade of the number of schools built and of children attending them, and of the manner in which the various standards are passed by the scholars. To judge from these it might be supposed that the national idea of what education can accomplish for the people is fully answered, for the statements on the heads just named sound as if all was being accomplished that education could effect. In our opinion there is a much more important standard by which our educational efforts must be tested, and by which success or failure must be determined. Education, to be worthy of the name, must do much to form the character of those who enjoy its advantages. If they become loyal, moral, law-abiding, religious, industrious citizens, then the education must be pronounced a success. So far as they fail in attaining any of these characteristics we must regard it as a failure. If we could know the future history of the children educated in any school we should be able to judge of its excellence when tried by this standard; if we could have the same information respecting the children educated in all our elementary schools, we should be able to form a trustworthy opinion of the merits of our national system. But as such information is not attainable we must be content to test its results partially, by such information as In the absence of such detailed knowis within our reach. ledge as we could desire, we must have recourse to such general trustworthy accounts of the moral condition of the country as are obtainable. For this purpose we naturally turn to the elaborate returns of the crimes annually committed. as they must be an important element in our investigation. From them we may obtain a foundation from which to institute a comparison of the growth of our educational system and of the influence it has had upon the morals of the country.

This obvious test is one of which we heard much when the Education Act of 1870 was under discussion. The influence of education in diminishing crime was then urged as an important reason for incurring the great expense with which the country was invited to saddle itself. Latterly we have heard less of it. The late Sir Charles Reed, chairman of the London School Board, rarely opened a new Board school without assuring his hearers that no investment could be more profitable than that which they were making in supplying London with excellent schools, in which the children would be well Not only would the schools prove a blessing to the children who were educated within their walls, but the tone of morality would be greatly raised, crime would rapidly diminish, the cost of its repression would be ever making less demands upon the purses of the ratepayers, and punishments would be so much lessened, that it would have seemed, from some of his more impassioned flights of oratory, that the ratepayers might anticipate being able to pay their School Board rate out of their savings from the sums they had previously been compelled to furnish for the maintenance of the police and the cost of prisons.

The system thus praised has now been in existence for more than twenty years; the London School Board has expended between eight and nine millions in erecting schools, and considerably more than that sum in maintaining them. It may be well, therefore, for us to examine how far the prophecies so confidently uttered some years since have

been so ea whice prop with deter surve and Reec metr of its other mitter

catio

publi

Fost

addi

satis

acco

In I

1892

1,878 in I 19.35 dicat place cost 23,84 men be f than desir 22,7 was the r Whi by n

ing

per o

vear

rapid

For

ever

datio

amo

stics we future fould be fard; if children able to national we must ation as I knowto such of the aturally injection.

Oct.

of the aturally nmitted, igation. to institem and ntry. hen the nfluence an imhich the e heard he Lonwithout e profit-London be well to the tone of iminish, emands rould be ne of his s might e out of en comand the

ence for has exschools, g them. far the ce have been verified or falsified by what has occurred. Nothing is so easy and so pleasant as to prophesy that that will happen which we wish should happen; it is another matter when our prophecies have to be submitted to the test of a comparison with the facts by which the truth of their prevision has to be determined. In instituting this comparison we shall make our survey for the whole country, and not for the metropolis alone, and in doing so we favour, rather than injure, Sir Charles Reed and those who adopted language similar to his, as the metropolis stands very low in the proportion of the number of its children who are under instruction when compared with other parts of the country, whilst the ratio of crimes committed within its borders is much above the average.

When we compare the provision made for elementary education, or the number of children under instruction in our public elementary schools at the time of the passing of Mr. Foster's Bill, with what is found at the present day, we find additions which the most ardent educationists must deem satisfactory, as they show an enormous increase of school accommodation and in the number of children attending them. In 1870 the elementary schools sufficed for the education of 1,878,584 scholars, or for 8.75 per cent. of the population, whilst in 1891 there was accommodation for 5,628,201 scholars, or 19:35 per cent. of the population. Of the large increase thus indicated voluntary efforts provided 1,769,221 seats, or 3,647,805 places in all, whilst school boards furnished 1,980,396. cost to the ratepayers of providing these board schools was 23,846,174l. Assuming the estimate of the Education Department to be correct, that one-sixth of the population should be found in elementary schools, it will be seen that more than that proportion of it could find school places, if they so desired. In 1871 the population of England and Wales was 22,712,216, and the number of children in average attendance was 1,231,434; in 1891 the population was 29,001,018, and the number of children in average attendance was 3,749,956. Whilst, therefore, the population had increased in twenty years by nearly 28 per cent., the average number of children attending public elementary schools had grown by more than 300 per cent., and this increase had proceeded steadily year after year; the only difference being that this growth was at a more rapid rate in the earlier years after 1871 than in the later ones. For immediately after the law had made it compulsory on every parish to find an adequate amount of school accommodation for all the children living within its borders an immense amount of school building had to be executed in neglected

districts both of town and country. After this demand had been complied with all that was needed was to keep pace with the growth of population. We may therefore take it for granted that comparatively few persons under thirty years of age have grown up without having attended school for a longer or shorter period, and, therefore, that the criminal statistics will give us a not unfair notion of the influence that such education

has had upon the morals of the community.

Before speaking of the number of criminals let us look at the provision made for the prevention and detection of crime; for the glowing periods of Sir Charles Reed would lead us to expect that so much higher moral principles would be infused into the more educated people that there would be less need for costly measures to be taken to prevent their injuring or preying upon their fellows. In 1870 there were 26,441 men in the ranks of the police and constabulary, and their cost to the country was 2,182,5211; in 1890 (the latest returns published) the same force numbered 39,221 men in its ranks, and for their maintenance a sum of 3,846,508/. had to be levied. So that whilst population had grown by something less than 28 per cent., the number of men employed in the police force had increased by nearly 47 per cent., whilst the cost to the country of this force was more than 75 per cent. greater in 1890 than it was twenty years previously. The infliction, therefore, of rates amounting last year to 3,324,326l. for the support of the School Boards of the country, so far from diminishing the expense considered necessary for preserving order and repressing crime, has been accompanied by an annually increasing demand upon the pockets of the people, and amounted last year to 1,663,987l.

It may be thought that if the cost of preventing and detecting crime shows such an increase, at all events the expenses attendant upon punishing it have diminished. Here the figures are somewhat deceptive for purposes of the comparison before us, because during the last twenty years a somewhat more expeditious method of dealing with prisoners has been introduced, which has caused them to be detained for a much shorter time in prison before trial, though it appears, from what has been recently said in the newspapers, that there is still need for further improvement in this direction; and besides that punishments have recently been much more lenient than they commonly were in past times. Moreover there has been a rearrangement of prisons, so that some have been shut up, and the prisoners transferred to other gaols, by which establishment charges have been diminished. Here, however,

is the ing t Treas 645,2 of re in all cent., be m fact t did in tories formal

even W

crime

to th

becon

mater

of off

1892

that o numb 1890 but t 1879 tried i under guilty chang that a police both it mu for th moral deten mater doubt returr to giv but w

punis

been r

son in

give u

theref

nd had ice with e it for years of a longer tics will ucation

us look ction of would s would e would nt their ere were ary, and e latest men in 081, had y someloyed in hilst the er cent. y. The 24,326% y, so far for preinied by of the

ing and the ex-. Here he comyears a risoners detained appears, nat there on; and e lenient here has een shut y which however, is the account of the matter. In 1870 the cost of maintaining the prisons was 490,637l., of reformatories (paid by the Treasury) 63,969l., and of industrial schools 90,655l., together 645,261l.; in 1890 the maintenance of prisons cost 326,551l., of reformatories 66,095%, and of industrial schools 272,287%, in all 664,9311; so that the increase is only about 11 per cent., whilst the growth of the population has been shown to be much greater. And it is only fair to call attention to the fact that the prisons cost considerably less in 1890 than they did in 1870, whilst the extra outlay has been upon reformatories and industrial schools, which are designed for the reformation and better moral training of youthful criminals,

even more than for their punishment.

When we come to an examination of the number of crimes committed, and the amount of punishment meted out to the offenders who have been captured, the comparison becomes more difficult. The criminal laws have been so materially altered that, if we had regard only to the number of offenders arraigned in a particular way, we might imagine that crime was rapidly on the decrease. Thus in 1870 the number of persons tried for indictable offences was 16,742, in 1890 10,761. This shows a very considerable diminution, but then in the interval the Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1879 was passed, and under its provisions many persons were tried in 1890 by the magistrates, and are consequently reckoned under a different category, who would have ranked as criminals guilty of indictable offences previous to its enactment. The change is no doubt a good and desirable one; for the sooner that an offender can be tried after he has been captured by the police, and a suitable punishment inflicted upon him, the better both for himself and for the community. For himself, because it must rarely happen that a long sojourn in prison, waiting for the next quarter sessions or for the assizes, can tend to his moral improvement; for the community, because the long detention of suspected criminals in prison awaiting trial must materially add to the cost of administering the law. No doubt it is the aim of those who compile the elaborate returns included in the volume designated Criminal Statistics to give the most faithful and complete information possible; but when the laws relating to criminals, and the amount of punishment to be meted out to them for their crimes, have been materially modified, it makes a perfectly accurate comparison impossible. There are, however, two heads of offences that give us some idea of the growth of crime in the country, and therefore in one of these, if not in both, we have to make

considerable allowances. We may nevertheless feel that we have a certain amount of information on which we may depend for purposes of the comparison we are making.

The first of these is the number of offences summarily Here we have to make allowance for the crimes thus described, which in earlier days would have been classified under the head of indictable offences, of which we have already spoken, and beside this some new offences have been created which add to the numbers in the recent tables that did not exist in the earlier ones. We refer especially to the persons charged by the School Boards and Local Attendance Committees with not sending their children to school, and of these there were 78,091 in 1890, who in 1870 might have been equally neglectful, but who would not then have had to answer for their neglect in the police court. But after making all the allowance required for the changes just indicated we still find a formidable addition to the number of offenders. For in 1871 there were 407,859 persons summarily convicted of misdemeanours of one kind or another; in 1890 the number had risen to 605,921, showing a much larger ratio of increase

than of the population.

The other head is that of juvenile offenders. In the earlier returns there were comparatively few industrial schools. Consequently children were not infrequently convicted for stealing two or three times in the course of a year, and no effectual steps were taken for keeping them for a lengthened period out of the way of temptation to commit crime, and for reforming their character. During the last few years very energetic measures have been taken in this direction, and these appear to us amongst the best and most promising improvements that have been effected in our plans for dealing with The tables show that in the year 1869-70 there were 4,356 children detained in reformatories, and 5,146 in industrial schools, whilst in 1889-90 the numbers had risen to 4,183 in reformatories and 16,166 in industrial schools. cases we take for the purpose of comparison the number under detention at the close of the year. We have every reason to hope that the children thus compulsorily detained, frequently for a period of five years, are greatly improved by the teaching they receive and the discipline they undergo; but it must be obvious that their removal from the corrupting influences of their homes and the opportunities for committing crimes must materially influence the number of offences; for to keep them out of harm's way for five years is practically to remove probable offenders for that long period from the possibility

of tr impr to th schoo coun befor venti

1892

· C innoce have b the pi taken worke under been 1 They a

prese

industr parents food, o were sl slap th wander 'If

London respons one in commit been er cost, no

It i in our does n number Then, a left ung the poli persons siderab. injured evidenc of the o it is wo of transgressing, and so at considerable cost to the country improving our criminal returns to a very perceptible extent.

There is, however, another side to be considered in relation to the great increase in the number of children in industrial schools, when we are inquiring into the moral condition of the country, of which we must not lose sight. This is brought before us in the Report of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, to which Report we shall presently have to call more particular attention.

'Countless children, spoken of by neighbours as once joyous, innocent, and home-loving "before that step-mother came near," have been driven to truancies and desperations which have ended in the public having to provide for them. Brutal fathers who have taken to drink have driven laborious little daughters, most willing workers for them, to find their bed under a hedge till they found it under a roof provided out of the taxes. Yet not a little finger has been lifted to make these inhuman people wince for their conduct. They are full citizens, not even paupers.'

Your committee has applied for fourteen children to be sent to industrial schools, and in eleven of these cases one or other of the parents was sent to prison, either for not having provided lodging or food, or for committing assaults, or for all three, though some of them were sleek-looking enough. Those who perpetually curse, bully, and slap their children are almost sure to drive some of them into a wandering life or to desperate deeds.

'If at the beginning, say, of the past fifteen years, in which in London alone 12,500 children have been sent to industrial schools, responsibility for the child's condition had been brought home to but one in each twelve sent by a sentence of six months' hard labour, your committee is of opinion that not a few of that 12,500 might now have been enjoying ordinary children's freedom and maintenance at the cost, not of the State, but of their own parents.' 1

It is worth noting that, notwithstanding the great increase in our detective force, the number of criminals apprehended does not bear a higher proportion when compared with the number of offences committed than it did twenty years since. Then, as now, about one half of the crimes committed were left unpunished; at least the number of offences reported to the police was, and is, about double of that of the number of persons apprehended, and of those apprehended a very considerable number escape conviction, partly because the persons injured refused to prosecute, and partly for want of sufficient evidence to make it certain that the person accused was guilty of the offence with which he was charged. In this connexion it is worthy of consideration how far on the one hand the

n both

under

son to

uently

aching

nust be

nces of

s must

p them

remove

sibility

1892

Oct.

it we

may

arily

rimes

lassi-

have

been

that o the

lance

nd of

have

ad to

aking

ed we

nders.

victed

mber

crease

n the

hools.

d for

nd no

hened

e, and

s verv

these

prove-

<sup>1</sup> Report, 1889, pp. 34, 35.

1892

increase in the police force has prevented the commission of crime, and, on the other, how far the spread of education has helped persons guilty of crimes to escape detection.

There is a very remarkable memorandum, addressed by the chief constable of Manchester to the Watch Committee of that city, bearing on this subject, that throws considerable light on what has just been said. The memorandum is dated December 17, 1891.

'While far from depreciating the good effects upon the masses which have sprung from the Education Act, the chief constable can state to the committee that there never was a time when crimes were so frequently committed by persons of good education as the present. The value of property stolen by ordinary thieves, &c., during the year was 6,398/.; whereas the amount by which various firms, &c., were defrauded by persons of good education by means of forgery and fraud during the same period was upwards of 90,000/. From the very nature of the cases these delinquencies are in the majority of cases hushed up; but the chief constable can readily give particulars of many cases where persons of good position have absconded, rendered restitution, and otherwise condoned their offences. Hardly a day passes that letters are not received complaining of "long firm" frauds, which are rampant in all parts of the country, and all of which require the ingenuity and dexterity which are alone given by a good education.'

In the same paper the chief constable states that,

'as regards indictable crime, *i.e.* such cases as are triable at sessions and assizes, the chief constable has caused a table to be prepared showing that the number of such cases reported during the last five years (1887 to 1891) in Manchester was 8,166; apprehensions, 2,022; committed for trial, 1,453, or 71'8 per cent.; persons discharged, 569, or 28'1 per cent.'

From what has been said it will be seen that the *Criminal Statistics* issued by the Home Office must necessarily include only a portion of the wrongdoings of the people of the land. The Report of the chief constable of Manchester is conclusive upon this point; and no doubt his experience is shared by others in a similar position all over the country. Such information could never find its way into official returns, however anxious the compilers of such returns might be to make them as exhaustive as possible. We have, therefore, before us the most favourable account of the immorality of the country that could be given by those charged with the duty of administering the criminal laws of the land and making the results known.

There are two other points to which we must call atten-

tion i of th is giv have a sys by w syste reckle conte symp to set side a in wh whom their the st to the peopl been expec set to all kin strike which emplo instru disput previo brings union. make a wid

discipling The of the possib seem of as to opropose its being a foul Moreo have estions were asserted.

VOL

ordina

Oct. 1892

on of

ed by nittee erable dated

masses ble can s were resent. ne year

were ry and m the ority of iculars onded,

Hardly g firm" which a good

essions repared ast five 2,022; harged,

iminal nclude e land. conclushared Such

s, howmake before country of ading the

l atten-

tion in order to present as complete a picture as we are able of the subject under consideration, though no information is given concerning them in the records of crime to which we have been hitherto referring. The last decade has witnessed a system of strikes on a far greater scale than most of those by which they were preceded, and carried on in a far more systematic manner, and with a greater resort to violence and reckless disregard for the rights of others. With some of the contentions of the workpeople we have had considerable sympathy—not with the endeavours of some of their leaders to set class against class, to range the workpeople on the one side and their employers on the other; whilst for the manner in which the strikers have trampled upon the freedom of those whom they designated blacklegs, and recklessly endangered their limbs, if not their lives, we can speak only in terms of the strongest reprobation. Such a course seems to us fatal to the prosperity of the country and the well-being of the people. In these contests the underlying idea evidently has been that of a war between classes—a war in which every expedient was lawful that might lead to victory. Pickets were set to hinder non-unionists from being employed; violence of all kinds was employed against them, and the success of a strike seems to have been made to depend upon the terror which could be inspired into the hearts of those to whom the employers appealed for assistance. No doubt the growth of instruction has something to answer for with regard to these disputes. It has made the men understand more than they previously did the pleasures which the possession of money brings with it, and the advantages which they can gain by union. These are far from being evils in themselves; but to make them really beneficial there is needed to balance them a wider view of the whole situation than working people ordinarily possess, and a high moral sense to enable them to discipline their power and to use it in legitimate ways.

There is, however, a worse feature in the moral condition of the country to which we must call attention. It is impossible to say that it is of very recent origin, but it would seem that until quite lately it did not exist to such an extent as to call public attention to it. But, whenever it assumed the proportions in which it is now found, there can be no doubt of its being a deep disgrace to the civilization of the country, and a foul blot upon its morality: we refer to cruelty to children. Moreover if the vaunted education cannot influence those who have enjoyed its advantages to discharge aright the obligations which nature imposes and which are admirably performed

VOL. XXXV.—NO. LXIX.

(

by brute beasts, what moral effect in other ways can it be supposed to have? So that, even if it could be shown that such brutality of parents towards their children existed in pre-education days as is now brought to light (which it cannot be), the charge of moral failure against the present system would not be lessened.

To proceed, however, with what is now known concerning this most painful subject. Some seven years since a society was formed in London for the protection of children; more recently its operations have been extended to a large part of the country. We have already had occasion to quote from its Report a paragraph relating to children sent to industrial schools. We now desire to draw more largely from what is contained in its pages, and to show that much of what is alleged concerning the cruelty of parents to their children must apply to parents who have been educated within the last twenty years at our public elementary schools, and as proof of this it is to be noted that the offenders were all of the class that must have attended school.

'The average age of the children continues almost the same—three and a half years old—and of the number of children in the families where the offences occur that is about the same, being three; and the average wage of the offender is still high. Most of the men of the families were in good employment, were decent, but lacked human nature. Against the class of persons recently appearing before the Sweating Commission of the House of Lords your committee has not had so much as a complaint. Squalor and wretchedness there has at times been enough of, but then it has been the culpable squalor and wretchedness of selfish and ill-conditioned men, who have all too long been allowed to be a law to themselves.' 1

Of the cruelties inflicted this is a summary account:—

'Most of the victims have been young; many were babies, made habitually to feel the oppression of hatred, the dizziness of famine, and scarifying, and curses; blows and kicks, and floggings with the oppressors' straps, pokers, ropes, boots, chairs, kettles, and frying-pans; diggings into with prongs of fork and blade of knife; putting mustard oil into wounds, burning with hot irons, and the whole theory and practice of fiends going straight for the greatest amount of anguish that could be inflicted on the most sensitive parts of a helpless child. Spain in history scarcely afforded an example of diabolical inventiveness compared with the hate-possessed parent of England of to-day.

'Amongst the cases are hanging a child up by the neck by a slip strap to a hook in the kitchen ceiling till black in the face and unconscious; thrusting a poker red hot through the closed lips into the mouth, burning lips, tongue, and under the tongue; putting bare little

1 Report, 1889, p. 21.

thighs beatin " ring the wi plaster it und again ( while and sl room : out of in yard rately ness, n arm, o and in much.

1892

Of 'In 1884, 1 proved childre

No do have have have have have have have much quotin large to covere

sangui religio at a g no gro dition is a go in the police kinds or ratio to is a sui such as show in t be that d in nnot stem

Oct.

1892

ming ciety more art of m its strial at is lat is

ldren
the
d as
all of

milies; and nen of tuman ore the ee has there alpable, who

, made amine, ith the g-pans; nustard ory and anguish s child. rentiveo-day.

o-day.
y a slip
and unnto the
are little

thighs on top of hot ironing stove; making child grasp red-hot poker; beating with poker on the head, making, as the doctor called it, a "ring of bruises" completely round it; throwing sick child out of the window, breaking arm and leg; deliberately taking off comforting plaster cast put on to little cripple at hospital, smashing it, throwing it under the bed, and leaving the puny creature to pine in old pain again day and night; fixing big jaws of teeth in the fat of the thigh while child under bed for refuge, dragging it out, standing up with it and shaking it "as a dog shakes a rat;" flinging a baby across a room at a wall; immersing for half an hour, naked, in freezing tank out of doors; tying, naked, to post in the yard, in the night; putting in yard for two hours, tied in chair, child with bronchitis; deliberately taking off splints newly put upon broken leg, and, of wantonness, making child go about so; sending child about with broken arm, of malice to it; and endless starvations when there was plenty, and imprisonments in attics and coal cellars for days, without so much as a drop of water.' 1

Of the number of children dealt with, this is the record :-

'Including its whole history from the formation of its nucleus in 1884, 11,690 complaints have been dealt with, of which 10,121 were proved to be true. These cases affected the welfare of 24,583 children.' 2

No doubt in every age and in every rank of society there have been some brutal parents; the startling thing is to find such a number, and that at a time when education has been made general in the country, and its beneficial effects are so much vaunted. The Society from whose Report we have been quoting appears to have seventy-one branches in as many large towns, so that as yet only a portion of the country is covered with its organizations.

If we compare these results with the anticipations of the sanguine believers in the influence of education, apart from religion, upon the moral condition of the country, we shall see at a glance how utterly wrong they were. There are really no grounds whatever for looking upon the present moral condition of England as better than it was in 1870, whilst there is a good deal to compel us to fear that our course has been in the opposite direction. The enormous increase in the police force must have made it more difficult to commit many kinds of crime than it was when their numbers bore a less ratio to the population, and yet it is hard to say where there is a substantial diminution. Crimes of the worst description, such as murder and offences against property with violence, show no signs of diminution, whilst the number of suicides

<sup>1</sup> Report, 1891, pp. 33, 34.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 33.

228

has so greatly increased as to make it evident that the religious belief, which acted as an effectual preventive against the crime of self-murder, is weakened. The massing of ever-increasing multitudes in our large towns has no doubt a tendency to lower the religious beliefs and practices of numbers of our fellow-countrymen, whilst there are other causes at work to leaven their minds with the materialistic tendencies of the age.

Unhappily people are very unwilling to learn from experience. Great schemes are started, like that introduced by the Education Act of 1870; political sympathies are enlisted in their support; the opponents of the existing state of things are anxious to overthrow that which is antagonistic to their own views; they prophesy all possible good as the necessary consequence of following their plans, and then after they have so committed themselves their only anxiety is to prove that they were right. They quote whatever figures or statements support what they had prophesied, without in any way explaining differences in administration that have arisen, which would altogether disprove the truth of their theories. They ignore all facts and figures that would contradict the conclusions which they wish to draw, or that would in any way throw doubts upon the perfect truth of the theory or practice for which they are contending. And whilst one-sided experts thus throw dust in the eyes of the public, people generally are too indifferent and too inert to make inquiries for themselves. They are content to be deceived, to continue in their old belief, to satisfy themselves that all is as it should be if stated by men of their own political or theological opinions. And so evil proceeds undiscovered and unimproved; and it will be well if at some not distant day the whole country has not a rude awakening to find that amongst great masses of our fellowcountrymen all real belief in the truths of Christianity has become a thing of the past, and that morality has come to be regarded purely as a matter of expediency, resting upon no religious sanction, and that its precepts therefore, as ordinarily understood, may be obeyed or set at naught without fear of consequences, as each individual may determine for himself.

1892

A Co

THIS assist carefi have involv corda occur gint, Testa collec Not c this C excep told praisi are st a pior in 17 Kirch had la been e to be more of the corda begun only 1 Field' work. access under to wh corda It que Aquil άβυσο given adds a Hebre

additi

Oct.

gous rime

sing y to

our

k to

age.

ex-

d by

isted

nings

their

ssary

have

that

nents

vex-

vhich

They

nclu-

way

ctice

perts

y are

elves.

belief,

ed by

o evil

e well rude

ellow-

y has

to be

on no

narily

ear of

self.

## SHORT NOTICES.

A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament, including the Apocryphal Books. By the late Edwin Hatch, M.A., D.D., and Henry A. Redpath, M.A., assisted by other Scholars. Part I., A-ΒΩΡΙΘ. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892.)

THIS lengthy title, with its reference to scholars unnamed who have assisted in the compilation, suggests a work involving much and careful labour. This suggestion is confirmed by the tests which we have applied here and there to the work. The quantity of work involved will be easily imagined if we remind our readers that this Concordance professes, and with justice, to give in the order of their occurrence the references for all the Greek words found in the Septuagint, and also in the fragments of other Greek translators of the Old Testament-Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, &c.-which have been collected in the late Dr. Field's edition of the Hexapla of Origen. Not only are the Greek words given, but we are enabled by means of this Concordance to see at once what is the underlying Hebrew text except in cases where there is some doubt, and in these cases we are told by a special mark that there is a doubt. We must not in praising the amount of labour bestowed on the task forget, what we are sure the editors would not wish us to forget, that there was already a pioneer in the person of Trommius, whose Concordance, published in 1718, has been the one chiefly in use, and that even earlier still Kircher, whose references follow the order of the Hebrew alphabet, had laid a foundation for subsequent workers. Much has, however, been done in this as in other fields since those days, and the materials to be used in referring to the Greek text of the Septuagint have been more accurately and more fully collected, and the same is also true of the other Greek translators. When Trommius published his Concordance, the gigantic work of Holmes and Parsons was as yet not begun, while for his references to the other Greek translators he had only Montfaucon's then recently published Hexapla instead of Dr. Field's fuller and, so far as our present material goes, almost perfect The consequence of this large increase in the accuracy and accessibility of the available resources is that the Concordance now under review adds to and corrects the earlier work in the same field to which we have referred. Thus the first page of the new Concordance contains at least thirteen words not given in Trommius. It quotes eleven places where  $\tilde{a}\beta a\tau os$  occurs in the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and twenty-four uses of άβυσσος in the same translations; in neither case had Trommius given any reference to these translations. The present Concordance adds also one fresh reference for abaros in Bar. ii. 23, and one fresh Hebrew word, ψ, for which ἄβατος is used as a translation by the LXX in Jer. xxxiii. 18. The improvements are not only in the additional references, but also in the corrections made where verses are wrongly quoted. Thus Trommius quotes Sir. xlii. 24 for åβύσσου, whereas it should be xlii. 18, as in the new Oxford Concordance. More important corrections that have been made in the edition before us are those cases where a false reading had been quoted. Thus Trommius quotes Job xxxviii. 30 for  $\partial \beta \dot{\nu} \sigma \sigma \sigma \nu$ , whereas the real reading of the Septuagint is  $\partial \sigma \epsilon \beta \dot{\nu} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \dot{\nu}$ , the only authority for  $\partial \beta \dot{\nu} \sigma \sigma \sigma \nu$  being, according to Holmes and Parsons, the Complutensian edition. Similarly, Trommius refers to Neh. vii. 2 for the use of  $\partial \gamma a \theta \dot{\nu} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\nu}$ , but the right reading in this passage is not  $\partial \gamma a \theta \dot{\nu} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\nu}$  but  $\partial \lambda \eta \partial \dot{\gamma} \dot{\sigma} \dot{\rho}$ , as Schleusner long ago noticed. On turning again to Holmes and Parsons we find that the reading of Trommius is only based on the Aldine edition and one cursive manuscript of the Septuagint.

The best idea of the work will be gained from a brief summary of the first word of any great frequency of occurrence, viz. ἀγαθός. The references to this word cover seven columns and a quarter, arranged strictly according to the order of their occurrence in the Septuagint text (and in this respect the work differs in arrangement from that of Trommius), while opposite to each reference on the right-hand side is put a number intended to guide the user of the book to one or other of the various Hebrew words which are placed together at the head of the article as words rendered in the LXX by ἀγαθός. Thus thirteen Hebrew expressions appear in connexion with ayabos, but on examination we find that ayabos is used to translate most of them only once, and in other cases, e.g. that of ישר, in two out of three places where αγαθός is used to translate the word there is also a v.l. εὐθές. In the overwhelming majority of cases ἀγαθός is used as the Greek equivalent of Dip, for which it is quoted more than three hundred times. We may add that references are given to more than one hundred places in Greek translations other than the Septuagint where  $a\gamma a\theta \delta s$  is used, while Trommius does not seem to quote any. In the Apocryphal books, too, the new Concordance compares very favourably, in respect of this word, with that of Trommius; for it gives from Ecclesiasticus nearly three times as many instances of αγαθός as Trommius had done, while the latter gives no reference at all to Wisdom or Tobit or Judith.

We have said enough to indicate, at any rate, the *relative* excellence of the work compared with its predecessors in the same field. Its *absolute* value is a much more difficult matter to deal with, nor will it be necessary, even if it were possible, to discuss this; for there is no doubt that its relative merits are very great. In such a multitude of references to figures it is impossible that the editor, even using the great care of which the work shows constant signs, can have wholly avoided errors. One or two such we have noticed—thus, the references to  $a\beta\rho\rho\chi\epsilon a$  should be Sir. xxxii. 26, not Sir. xxxii. 20. Again, on p. 38, all the references to the use of  $air\epsilon i\nu$  in Daniel should be referred to (4), not (5), for they are the equivalent

of the Chaldee בַּעָא.

It is sometimes the fashion to depreciate such pasteboard and scissors work as concordances, and the studies based on them are often considered to be: but the composition of a concordance like the one under review would tax the powers of many men to a degree

of ca to th seem which soluti carrie the S distri as Mi impor power cott, Dr. V in the schola works Press libera in con bring rest o

1892

of wh

b WE h editio includ books same. so far by th varian impor add th to the same revisio the Ca Redpa proofs liberal sions when obtain many

even f

We h

togeth

The C

Oct.

ance.

lition

oted.

e real

ύσσου

ition.

s, but

s, as

and

n the

mary

γαθός.

arter,

n the

ement

n the

of the

laced

LXX

exion

ed to

word

άγαθός

more

given

r than

seem

dance

nat of

nes as

latter

excel-

field.

h, nor

there

multi-

, even

is, can

iced-

. xxxii.

τειν in

ivalent

rd and

em are

ce like

of which one who has not tried can have little idea, and the amount of careful arrangement and revision required to bring such a work to the accuracy which the Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint seems to have attained is inestimable. And as to the studies of which such works form the foundation, they are indispensable for the solution of many questions, and yet within certain limits they can be carried on by men of ordinary accuracy and ability. In the case of the Septuagint, for example, it is by a tabulating of usages and of the distribution of words or expressions based on such a concordance as Mr. Redpath has begun to edit, that questions of such general importance as the unity of the Greek translation or the literary powers and practice of the translators are to be examined. Dr. Westcott, who will not be suspected of being a grammatical pedant, and Dr. Vaughan both independently expressed the value of these studies in the preface to their editions of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and scholars at any rate will not undervalue the importance of such works as the LXX Concordance, and will, let us hope, support the Press which is issuing, with its well-known admirable care and liberality to scholarship, works such as that under notice. Let us in conclusion express the wish that Mr. Redpath may be able to bring his laborious undertaking to a successful close, and that the rest of the work may be worthy of such a beginning.

The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. Edited by Henry Barclay Swete, D.D. Vol. II. 1 Chron.—Tobit. (Cambridge University Press, 1891.)

WE have already noticed the first volume of this excellent manual edition, and also the separate issue of the Psalter, which is, however, included in this second volume in its proper place among the other books of the Old Testament. The plan of the work continues the same. A short introduction describing the MSS, used (except in so far as that has been already done in the first volume) is followed by the Greek text, based in the main on that of B. The chief variants found in other MSS. are given at the foot of the page, less important ones being relegated to the end of the volume. We may add that at the end of the volume are appended certain corrections to the first volume, which have been furnished by Dr. Nestle. The same German scholar has also generously furnished assistance in the revision of part at least of the volume before us. Further than that the Cambridge editor acknowledges the assistance of the Rev. H. A. Redpath, who 'within the last few months has worked through the proofs of this volume, with the exception of the Psalms, and has liberally communicated a considerable number of errata and omissions which had escaped notice.' It will hardly be expected that when so much skilled labour has been expended on the attempt to obtain correctness, the reviewer going over the same ground will find many mistakes. It seems to us that the errata and omissions are even fewer than they were in the first part, and that is high praise. We have, for example, tested in many places for long passages together the readings of C, the only new MS. of importance, as

degree

18

co

ex

be

WC

be

of

all

wh

in

SO

Li

pu

th

re

th

fo

bl

CO

su

ter

th

tie

de

th

fre

be

th th

given by Tischendorf in his edition of it, and, though more than once we thought we had detected omissions, we almost invariably found that, if the variant was not noted at the foot of the page, it was not neglected in the Appendix. We have only found four small points to notice. Thus in Job xxxv. 10 C has κατάσσων, which does not appear in the Cambridge edition, and in Job xxxv. 14 the variant ἐνάντειον is not noticed. In Prov. xvi. 25 the punctuation mark (?) δοκούσαι είναι ὀρθαί might have been given, as it is given in a similar case (Job xxxvii. 12). Again, in Prov. xvi. 32 the reading κρίσσων is passed over. Such deficiencies as exist are in the main due to the state of the material to be worked upon, and not to the way in which it is presented by the Cambridge editor. Thus for the Veronese Psalter Bianchini's edition is used, but it seems capable of improvement, as it leaves several uncertainties as to the reading of the MS. A collation or facsimile edition of the Psalter itself is to be desired. As Mr. Redpath has recently been to Verona for the purpose of securing such a collation, there is good hope that this desire may be speedily and satisfactorily gratified. The case of C, the famous Codex Ephraemi at Paris, is even worse. Tischendorf, in his edition of the MS., states that a great deal of its text is hardly to be deciphered. Indeed, Dr. Ceriani had suggested that the need for some verification of Tischendorf's results was so great that it was better to defer any attempt to give the readings of C till the larger Cambridge edition of the LXX was in preparation.

It may be well to draw attention to some of the principal points of interest in the volume. Firstly the lacuna, in the text of B, which occurs in the Psalms from cv. 27 to cxxxvii. 6, is here supplied from the Sinaitic, the earlier one in Genesis (where the Sinaitic was not extant) having been supplied from A. Secondly, the order of the books adopted deserves attention. It will be noticed that Job comes quite out of its usual place, and follows the Song of Songs. This position is given it in the Codex Vaticanus, and may be due, as Professor Ryle suggests, to the 'uncertainty about authorship.' Thirdly, the Greek text of Ecclesiasticus which falls into this volume deserves study. This has received greater prominence recently, owing to the investigations of Dr. Hatch in his Essays on Biblical Greek, and still more recently, owing to the work of Professor Margoliouth on this book. Lastly, we may draw attention to the peculiar character of the Greek text of x in the book of Tobit. It is, indeed, so peculiar, and so different from those of B and A, that it has been printed in

extenso under the text of B.

The work that remains to be done on the Septuagint is still great. That we may even have fresh material on which to work, perhaps of an extensive, and certainly of an important, kind is shown by the recently announced discovery of an uncial papyrus of parts of the minor Prophets, on which Professor Hechler read a paper at the last Congress of Orientalists. But meanwhile the materials that we have may be tested, sifted, and grouped. If this is to be done successfully one standard must be adopted for collation. The edition of the Cambridge Septuagint which we are noticing has been by the Oct.

than

riably

ge, it

small

does

rk (?) imilar

των is to the

which

onese orove-

e MS.

sired.'

ose of ay be

mous

dition

to be

ed for

it was larger

points

which from

of the

comes

This s Pro-

hirdly,

serves

to the

d still

n this

cter of

culiar,

ted in

great.

by the

of the

at the

s that

e done

edition

by the

course of circumstances selected for that standard, inasmuch as the specimen pages which are being circulated for testing the various Septuagint MSS. in existence are taken from that edition. And not only does its portable character make it on the whole as convenient an edition for purposes of collation as could be desired, but also its extreme accuracy and clearness give it a claim to be regarded as the best edition at present available. The third volume, completing the work, is announced by the Cambridge Press as being likely to appear before very long, and then scholars will be able to possess themselves of an edition of the Septuagint which has unquestionably superseded all previous editions, and is not itself likely to be superseded, even when the larger and more critical edition which the Cambridge Press intend to issue shall have appeared.

A Comparative Study of the Time in the Christian Liturgy at which the Elements are Prepared and set on the Holy Table. By J. WICKHAM LEGG, F.S.A., Hon. Treas. and Sec. of the Henry Bradshaw Liturgical Text Society. 4to. (London: Alabaster, Passmore and Sons, 1892.)

This paper, which occupies thirty-six pages, quarto, among the *Transactions of the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, comes (like Dan Prior's tale) 'extremely *à propos*,' while it has the merit of not having been written to order from materials hastily gathered with a purpose. Dr. Legg had been collecting his facts and making his notes for some ten years, and now the recent prosecution of the Bishop of Lincoln has suggested (and, happily, has not suggested in vain) the publication of his collection and its results.

Last November, when criticisms on the second Lambeth judgment in Read v, the Bishop of Lincoln came thick and fast, some of them assuring us that 'every Catholic schoolboy knows' this or that, and some from another quarter no less eager to tell that 'any reader' of 'our' Protestant tracts or journals 'could have informed the court' something or another contrary to its statements, we confess for our own part to have been, for the moment, fearful lest some blunders had been overlooked, sufficient, not indeed to invalidate the conclusions in the judgment, but to bring discredit on it. It was, therefore, with a feeling of relief that we read in the Guardian a summary of this paper, which we now welcome as we have it in extenso. We rejoiced to find that an English layman, endowed with the necessary learning and ability, had produced a catena of authorities which (apart from its interest to the liturgical antiquary) incidentally corroborated and established the very points in the judgment which had been represented as most open to attack.

As regards the mixed chalice, we had ourselves been taught in the study of Church history that this usage had come down to us from primitive times, and Dr. Legg (p. 52, n.) confirms us in our belief that it has been used by all communities of Christians, except the Armenians. Writing as a layman, he is not concerned to show that this or that moment in the liturgical action, or before its beginning, is the most (or the least) convenient; but his inquiries,

conducted with scientific impartiality, help us to see that our rubrics, being what they are, without addition and without alteration, admit the usage of a mixed cup, which to the minds of many Churchmen is a matter of importance prior to the precise time or manner of its mixture. Dr. Legg has fully proved that amid great diversity there were very many rites of old where the mixture was duly made, but yet was not made in the sight of the people. His researches on this point are tabulated (as regards the Western Church, previous to the year 1570) on eight pages at the end of the book, and they relate to upwards of one hundred cases (dioceses, religious orders, &c.) Besides this he has discussed the wider question of the time of the offertory and the preparation of the elements in the Eastern liturgies, in the Western liturgies both before and after the reform of Pope Pius V., and lastly in English liturgies (not, of course, neglecting Scotland and America). Two full-page pictures illustrate the text. The latter is a satisfactory reproduction (which we have compared with an original) of the frontispiece to the Auxerre Missal, printed by Veuve Michelin at Troyes in 1738 (of which Mr. Weale has noted nine copies in Continental libraries and none in England). depicts seventeen figures, among them the bishop at the altar, canons, &c., in copes and bands, and the three subdeacons in the act of bringing the mixed chalice, on the paten with the host, in procession (having passed, as the rubrics show, round the back) to the front of the altar. The picture is full of points of interest which Dr. Legg brings out in his text and notes. The other picture, facing p. 63, represents a painting of the Mass of St. Gregory, by Raffaelino del Garbo, in the first year of the sixteenth century. It supplies an instance of the appearance of a *gradin* at the back of the altar. is the earliest example known to Dr. Legg, whose researches on this and kindred matters of liturgical and archæological interest will be within the memory of our readers. The devout attitude of the great bishop and his two attendant ministers in the picture was manifestly not studied by rote from any manual of Pontifical ceremonies, and might even be not a little distressing to some masters of ceremonies of later times, but it almost reconciles us to the three-quarter northward position (towards the open Missal) which the consciences of some English priests have considered to be morally incumbent upon them since the appearance of the Archbishop's judgment. At all events, with this picture before us, we cannot truthfully say that it is an impossible, or even of necessity a grotesque position. It is, however, due to Dr. Legg to add that he has not made this last observation in his paper. He has brought it forward for the sake of proving another point, namely, the occasional use of the altar as a kind of prothesis.

Dissertations on the Apostolic Age. Reprinted from Editions of St. Paul's Epistles by the late J. B. Lightfoot, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1892.)

No commentaries on any portions of the New Testament Scriptures have taken and maintained a higher place in the opinion of scholars than those on three—alas! that they were only three—of St. Paul's

Ep wit abr the sen from

189

to tion ma whi St. Sen

two

wh

adr

the and his

por

foc

COL

and

to am sep led giv pur per the foot full

vie Es. had soo of 1

COI

mi

wh

hin the cla ct.

ics.

mit

ien

its

ere

but

his

the

c.) the

ies,

ope

ing

ext.

red

by

ted

his

ns,

of

ion

of

63,

del

an

It

his

be

eat

stly

ind

ies

th-

me

em nts, im-

ver,

in

her

St.

res

ars ul's

s.

Epistles by the late Bishop Lightfoot; and the public has watched with eagerness for a fulfilment of the expectation which has got abroad that more were to come from the same source. Meanwhile the trustees of the Lightfoot Fund have done good service by presenting to the wide circle of English readers, 'in a form separate from the Greek text and commentary, such of the late bishop's valuable excursuses as from the nature of the subjects treated admit of this severance without loss of clearness.' The introductions to the Epistles are by this limitation omitted, and also one dissertation, Were the Galatians Celts or Teutons? But what a wealth of matter is suggested to the memory by the titles of the dissertations which are now made generally accessible!—The Brethren of the Lord, St. Paul and the Three, The Christian Ministry, St. Paul and Seneca, The Essenes.

The dissertations are reprinted without change or addition, except two important additions from Bishop Lightfoot himself, but a table which Professor J. E. B. Mayor had drawn up has enabled the editor to make the valuable Index of Passages more complete.

From Bishop Lightfoot himself are added his reasons for accepting the Seven Epistles of the Middle Form as the genuine work of Ignatius, and extracts from his writings, extending over twenty years, which give his views on the Christian Ministry.

This latter subject is one which is in itself of such supreme importance, and one, moreover, in which the opinion of Bishop Lightfoot has been so often misrepresented in recent and in present controversies, that we venture to quote the additional note in full, and to invite special attention to it. Lord Grimthorpe is reported to have complained lately that the Lightfoot trustees, or some ritualist among them, had refused permission to some association to reprint separately the essay on The Christian Ministry. His legal knowledge might have reminded him that trustees are not empowered to give away property which is committed to their trust for a definite purpose, and the association on behalf of which he complained might, perhaps, have told him that Bishop Lightfoot had personally declined the same request. The essay is now given in full with Bishop Lightfoot's own comments and a short explanatory note, and we thankfully avail ourselves of the opportunity of helping to give these comments the wide circulation which they deserve. Those who have misinterpreted the Essay in the past have had little excuse. Those who continue to do so will have none :-

<sup>&#</sup>x27;The following extracts from Bishop Lightfoot's works illustrate his view of the Christian Ministry over and above the particular scope of the Essay in his "Commentary on the Philippians." He felt that unfair use had been made of that special line of thought which he there preserved, and soon after the close of the Lambeth Conference of 1888 he had this collection of passages brinted.

of passages printed.

'It is felt by those who have the best means of knowing, that he would himself have wished the collection to stand together simply as his reply to the constant imputation to him of opinions for which writers wished to claim his support without any justification.

1893

scru

WOU

anx who

Ess

the

tion

con Chi

sati

Car

this

WO

uni

cep

pra hea

acc

vou litu

of 1

wh

If 1

sta

uni

the

the and

sar

fro

SO

los

fro

of

wo

the

Ch

Ch

inf

Te

loc

mo

Cr

## 1. Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (' Essay on the Christian Ministry, 1868).

(i.) Unless we have recourse to a sweeping condemnation of received documents, it seems vain to deny that early in the second century the episcopal office was firmly and widely established. Thus during the last three decades of the first century, and consequently during the lifetime of the latest surviving Apostle, this change must have been brought about.1

(ii.) The evidence for the early and wide extension of episcopacy throughout proconsular Asia, the scene of St. John's latest labours, may be considered irrefragable.2

(iii.) But these notices, besides establishing the general prevalence of episcopacy, also throw considerable light on its origin. . . . Above all they establish this result clearly, that its maturer forms are seen first in those regions where the latest surviving Apostles (more especially St. John) fixed their abode, and at a time when its prevalence cannot be dissociated from their influence or their sanction.3

(iv.) It has been seen that the institution of an episcopate must be placed as far back as the closing years of the first century, and that it cannot, without violence to historical testimony, be dissociated from the name of St. John.4

(v.) If the preceding investigation be substantially correct, the threefold ministry can be traced to Apostolic direction; and short of an express statement we can possess no better assurance of a Divine appointment or at least a Divine sanction. If the facts do not allow us to unchurch other Christian communities differently organized, they may at least justify our jealous adhesion to a polity derived from this source.5

## 2. Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians ('Preface to the Sixth Edition'), 1881.

The present edition is an exact reprint of the preceding one. This statement applies as well to the Essay on the Threefold Ministry, as to the rest of the work. I should not have thought it necessary to be thus explicit, had I not been informed of a rumour that I had found reason to abandon the main opinions expressed in that Essay. There is no foundation for any such report. The only point of importance on which I have modified my views, since the Essay was first written, is the authentic form of the letters of St. Ignatius. Whereas in the earlier editions of this work I had accepted the three Curetonian letters, I have since been convinced (as stated in later editions) that the seven letters of the Short Greek are genuine. This divergence, however, does not materially affect the main point at issue, since even the Curetonian letters afford abundant evidence of the spread of episcopacy in the earliest years of the second century.

But, on the other hand, while disclaiming any change in my opinions, I desire equally to disclaim the representations of those opinions which have been put forward in some quarters. The object of the Essay was an investigation into the origin of the Christian Ministry. The result has been a confirmation of the statement in the English Ordinal, 'It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.' But I was

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> P. 199, ed. 1; p. 201, later edd.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> P. 212, ed. 1; p. 214, later edd.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> P. 225, ed. 1; p. 227, later edd.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> P. 232, ed. I; p. 234, later edd. <sup>5</sup> P. 265, ed. I; p. 267, later edd.

scrupulously anxious not to overstate the evidence in any case; and it would seem that partial and qualifying statements, prompted by this anxiety, have assumed undue proportions in the minds of some readers, who have emphasized them to the neglect of the general drift of the Essay.

3. Sermon preached before the Representative Council of the Scottish Episcopal Church in St. Mary's Church at Glasgow, October 10, 1882. [Sermons preached on Special Occasions, p. 182 sq.]

When I spoke of unity as St. Paul's charge to the Church of Corinth, the thoughts of all present must, I imagine, have fastened on one application of the Apostolic rule which closely concerns yourselves. Episcopal communities in Scotland outside the organization of the Scottish Episcopal Church—this is a spectacle which no one, I imagine, would view with satisfaction in itself, and which only a very urgent necessity could justify. Can such a necessity be pleaded? 'One body' as well as 'one Spirit,' this is the apostolic rule. No natural interpretation can be put on these words which does not recognise the obligation of external, corporate union. Circumstances may prevent the realization of the apostle's conception, but the ideal must be ever present to our aspirations and our prayers. I have reason to believe that this matter lies very near to the hearts of all Scottish Episcopalians. May God grant you a speedy accomplishment of your desire. You have the same doctrinal formularies: you acknowledge the same episcopal polity: you respect the same liturgical forms. 'Sirs, ye are brethren.' Do not strain the conditions of reunion too tightly. I cannot say, for I do not know, what faults or what misunderstandings there may have been on either side in the past. If there have been any faults, forget them. If there exist any misunderstandings, clear them up. 'Let the dead past bury its dead.'

While you seek unity among yourselves, you will pray likewise that unity may be restored to your Presbyterian brothers. Not insensible to the special blessings which you yourselves enjoy, clinging tenaciously to the threefold ministry as the completeness of the Apostolic ordinance and the historical backbone of the Church, valuing highly all those sanctities of liturgical office and ecclesiastical season, which, modified from age to age, you have inherited from an almost immemorial past, thanking God, but not thanking Him in any Pharisaic spirit, that these so many and great privileges are continued to you which others have lost, you will nevertheless shrink, as from the venom of a serpent's fang, from any mean desire that their divisions may be perpetuated in the hope of profiting by their troubles. 'Divide et impera' may be a shrewd worldly motto; but coming in contact with spiritual things, it defiles them like pitch. 'Pacifica et impera' is the true watchword of the Christian and the Churchman.

 The Apostolic Fathers, Part II., St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, vol. i. pp. 376, 377, 1885. [Pp. 390, 391, 1889.]

The whole subject has been investigated by me in an Essay on 'The Christian Ministry;' and to this I venture to refer my readers for fuller information. It is there shown, if I mistake not, that though the New Testament itself contains as yet no direct and indisputable notices of a localized episcopate in the Gentile Churches, as distinguished from the moveable episcopate exercised by Timothy in Ephesus and by Titus in Crete, yet there is satisfactory evidence of its development in the later years of the Apostolic age; that this development was not simultaneous

oct.

the

of ut.1 acy nay

e of all in ally be

t it the reeress nent

nent arch east

This
as to
thus
a to
ndahave
form
work
aced
a are

main ence ry. ions, hich was t has It is

cient

rs of

was

18

us

to

th wl

th

it

pe

CI

se

01

P

th

e

p

d

d

6

m

ta

b

b

sl

W

h

th

T

p

a

te

a

0

and equal in all parts of Christendom; that it is more especially connected with the name of St. John; and that in the early years of the second century the episcopate was widely spread and had taken firm root, more especially in Asia Minor and in Syria. If the evidence on which its extension in the regions east of the Ægean at this epoch be resisted, I am at a loss to understand what single fact relating to the history of the Christian Church during the first half of the second century can be regarded as established; for the testimony in favour of this spread of the episcopate is more abundant and more varied than for any other institution or event during this period, so far as I recollect.

5. Sermon preached before the Church Congress at Wolverhampton, October 3, 1887. [Sermons preached on Special Occasions, p. 259 sq.]

But if this charge fails, what shall we say of her isolation? Is not this isolation, so far as it is true, much more her misfortune than her fault? Is she to be blamed because she retained a form of Church government which had been handed down in unbroken continuity from the Apostolic times, and thus a line was drawn between her and the reformed Churches of other countries? Is it a reproach to her that she asserted her liberty to cast off the accretions which had gathered about the Apostolic doctrine and practice through long ages, and for this act was repudiated by the Roman Church? But this very position—call it isolation if you will—which was her reproach in the past, is her hope for the future. She was isolated because she could not consort with either extreme. She was isolated because she stood midway between the two. This central position is her vantage ground, which fits her to be a mediator, wheresoever an occasion of mediation may arise.

But this charge of isolation, if it had any appearance of truth seventy years ago, has lost its force now.

6. Durham Diocesan Conference. Inaugural Address. October 1887.

When I speak of her religious position I refer alike to polity and to doctrine. In both respects the negative, as well as the positive, bearing of her position has to be considered. She has retained the form of Church government inherited from the Apostolic times, while she has shaken off a yoke, which even in mediæval times our fathers found too heavy to bear, and which subsequent developments have rendered tenfold more oppressive. She has remained stedfast in the faith of Nicæa, but she has never compromised herself by any declaration which may entangle her in the meshes of science. The doctrinal inheritance of the past is hers, and the scientific hopes of the future are hers. She is intermediate and she may become mediatorial, when the opportunity occurs. It was this twofold inheritance of doctrine and polity which I had in view, when I spoke of the essentials which could under no circumstances be abandoned. Beyond this, it seems to me that large concessions might be made. Unity is not uniformity. . . . On the other hand it would be very short-sighted policy-even if it were not traitorous to the truth-to tamper with essentials and thus to imperil our mediatorial vantage ground, for the sake of snatching an immediate increase of numbers.

7. Address' on the Re-opening of the Chapel, Auckland Castle, August 1, 1888. [Leaders in the Northern Church, p. 145.]

But, while we 'lengthen our cords,' we must 'strengthen our stakes' likewise. Indeed this strengthening of our stakes will alone enable us to lengthen our cords with safety, when the storms are howling around

<sup>1</sup> This was delivered before a large number of the Bishops who had been present at the Lambeth Conference.

Oct.

cted

ond

ore

its

am

the

be

titu-

ton,

not

her

rom

the

she

oout

act

ll it

for

ther

two.

e a

enty

87.

d to

ring

arch

off

y to

ore

has

er in

and

she

oke

ned. nity

nted

with

the

st I,

kes'

e us

und

had

us. We cannot afford to sacrifice any portion of the faith once delivered to the saints; we cannot surrender for any immediate advantages the threefold ministry which we have inherited from Apostolic times, and which is the historic back-bone of the Church. But neither can we on the other hand return to the fables of mediævalism or submit to a yoke which our fathers found too grievous to be borne—a yoke now rendered a hundredfold more oppressive to the mind and conscience, weighted as it is by recent and unwarranted impositions of doctrine.

A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. By EMIL SCHÜRER. First Division. Two vols. Political History of Palestine from B.C. 175 to A.D. 135. Translated by Rev. John Macpherson. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1890.)

THE second division of this work has been now for a considerable period accessible in an English translation, and, according to a custom not unknown in Germany, the first division follows. second division dealt with the internal development of Tewish history and thought under the influence of the modifying factors of Hellenism on the one side, and Judaism, with its two main tendencies of Pharisaism and Sadduceeism, on the other. In this connexion Professor Schürer discussed the various forms of social, religious, and political communities which were formed in Palestine, according to the greater or lesser preponderance of Hellenism. He also traced the history of the Sanhedrim and High Priesthood, which were the expression of the Jewish political constitution. To complete the picture of Jewish intellectual and religious life, it was further necessary to explain the surroundings in the midst of which this life developed, with their various modifications. So the Temple, the Synagogue, the School, are each in turn dealt with. Moreover, this development was very definite in the lines along which it moved, viz. 'zeal for the law, and the Messianic hope,' and these, therefore, must be discussed. Nor could that large and increasingly important section of the Jewish nation which was scattered outside Palestine be ignored if the picture was to be complete, and therefore that branch of the subject is put forward. Such is in brief outline a sketch of the contents of the second division of Professor Schürer's work, and it will be seen at once with what a wealth of material he has to deal, material so varied and wide-spreading that the portion of the work which discusses it may rightly be called, as indeed it has been called, 'indispensable' to the student of the New Testament. The division which now completes the work gives the setting of the picture, for in it we have an account as full as the materials will allow of the successive political conditions under which this intellectual and religious development took place. The materials are often very scanty, but full use is made of the many sidelights, such as coins and inscriptions, which are often made to illumine the dark corners in an unexpected way. The English reader is also put in possession of a very full bibliography arranged at the head of each section. The translator has, however, perhaps intentionally, often omitted some of the authorities referred to in the German edition, and this must be matter for regret. Dr. Schürer begins by a dis-

cussion of the secondary means of information to which we have already alluded. He then examines very carefully the primary authorities to which the historian of to-day has to turn for his information, and these are divided into (a) the Books of Maccabees; (b) non-extant sources—that is to say, authorities known to have written on the history of the period whose works have perished, as for example, the historical works of Strabo; (c) Josephus; (d) Greek and Roman writers like Polybius or Dio Cassius, who incidentally furnish information relevant to Dr. Schürer's subject; (e) Rabbinical literature. The writer then proceeds with his main theme - the political history of Palestine from 175 B.C. onwards. It will be noticed that this leaves a considerable interval of time after the last events noticed in the Old Testament Canon, but this gap does not admit of much filling up. For the period of the Maccabees we have more material, and Dr. Schürer shows how the struggle for religious liberty against Syrian domination was continued even after that had been secured, as the dazzling prospect of political independence Then we follow the process of Maccabean aggrandisement, which attained its greatest territorial extent under Alexander Jannæus (B.C. 104-78).

'In the south the Idumeans had been subdued and judaised. In the north, Alexander's kingdom reached as far as Seleucia on the Lake Merom. The sea coast, on which Joppa had been the first conquest of the Maccabees, was all now completely under Jewish rule. . . . But also the country east of the Jordan was wholly under his sway; among them a number of the more important towns, which had previously been centres of Greek culture, such as Hippos, Gadara, Pella, Dium, and others' (i. I., 306).

But the strongly exclusive Judaism of Alexander by attempting wholly to destroy Greek culture really weakened his political strength. It is but a short interval before Pompey appears on the scene, and by his conquest of Palestine and capture of Jerusalem makes Jewish independence a thing of the past. During the troublous period of Roman history which followed, the political condition of Palestine underwent many changes. Its subsequent consolidation was due to the masterful mind of Herod the Great, and at this period we reach New Testament times. Dr. Schürer continues the history under the sons of Herod, until, in A.D. 6, Judea became a Roman province under Roman procurators, more or less dependent on the prefects of Syria. Under Agrippa I. a short period of nominal independence occurs, and then on his death in 44, leaving a son too young to succeed to the dominions of his father, the line of procurators is resumed and continues to the beginning of the war with Rome, which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Schürer carries the story on to the final loss of all political independence on the part of the Jews consequent on the rebellion of Bar-Cochba in the time of Hadrian. Scant justice has been done in this outline to the marshalled array of facts and the abundance of references which Dr. Schürer gives. Enough has, it is hoped, been said to recommend the book in its entirety to all who wish to

have intellated It is stood attendiate temp

1892

of who on or tates on we they are re 189) nearly thought is was Again

in ref

same

tively

detra work W the b reade itself vision The : refere the g Tewis of the zung schen it was turnin Gelel Giber

again says find witho

the w

(so he

and o

Oct.

have

nary

for-

;(b)

tten

for

reek

tally nical the

be

last

not

nave

ious

had

ence

ent.

nder

the

Lake st of

also hem

peen

and

ting

gth.

and

wish

d of

tine

e to

each

the

ince

is of

ence

to to

s is

me,

Dr.

in-

lion

lone

ince

ped,

n to

have as good a conception as can be obtained of the political, social, intellectual, and religious conditions of the origin of Christianity, and also of the process by which those conditions took their exact form. It is impossible that anyone can understand, as it should be understood, the Jewish background of Christianity without mastering, or attempting to master, the history and tendencies of the time immediately preceding its advent; and it would be waste of time to attempt to get such a mastery without utilizing the guidance afforded by Dr. Schürer's labours. It may be convenient at this point to add that an English index has been provided to all the five volumes of which the English form of the work in its entirety consists, based on one prepared by Dr. Schürer himself, and this immensely facilitates references on any particular subject. There are some points on which we should be disposed a little to criticize Dr. Schürer, but they fall mainly in the second division of the work, with which we are not now dealing. Is it, for example, correct to say (E. T. i. i. 189) that the Judea of the period after the exile 'corresponded nearly with the kingdom of Judah of earlier days'? We had rather thought-and the lists of places in Nehemiah seem to confirm this view—that the Judea of the period immediately after the exile was confined to a comparatively small district round Jerusalem. Again, it is not easy to reconcile the language used (E. T. i. i. 192) in reference to the Jewish element in Galilee with what is said on the same point later on (E. T. ii. i. 3). These are, however, comparatively speaking, trifles, which, even if the criticisms be just, do not detract from the extreme accuracy and great value of the book as a work of reference.

We have, however, now to turn from the intrinsic merit of the book to the way in which it has been presented to the English reader, and here we must find fault both with the translation itself in places, and also with the careless way in which the revision of the proofs has been made. Firstly, as to the translation. The second sentence in the book failed to explain itself without a reference to the German, for the English runs, 'No incident in the gospel story . . . is intelligible, apart from its setting in Jewish history, and without a clear understanding of that world of thought-distinction of the Jewish people' ('ohne die Voraussetzung des jüdischen Volkes und der ganzen Vorstellungswelt des jüdischen Volkes'). Again, from the argument at the bottom of p. 44, it was clear that the English did not make connected sense, and on turning to the German we find 'für letzteres ist der französische Gelehrte Gibert eingetreten,' translated by 'the French scholar Gibert pronounces in favour of the former view,' which just turns the whole argument round. On p. 281 of the first volume a negative (so he was not forced) in the English betrays itself as wrongly placed, and on reference to the German we find no trace of it. Further on, again (pp. 440, 453 n.), we find 'west' where the German rightly says 'east,' and a little earlier (on p. 372 and also pp. 374-5) we find A.D. where it should be B.C.—the German simply giving the date without either of these distinguishing marks. One or two other in-

VOL. XXXV.-NO. LXIX.

189

and

us :

ma

ess

son

nee

par the furt exp Gui

its 1

in t

mai

boo

rep

ago

was

upo

Han

the

und nex met

be .

Chr

has

lack

byst

stan

tian:

ratu

form

alth

acqu

struc

bool

com

Psyc

com

igno

has

full :

of vi

and

lists

arme

supp

stances of carelessness might be added, but those mentioned from one volume may suffice—former for latter, west for east, A.D. for B.C., and the insertion of a negative where the original had none. They are all transparent errors, but as such show the greater carelessness. We pass on to make a protest against the haphazard English which is made to do duty as a translation. Thus, if the German writer can say (i. 2, 457) 'Gegenüber dem nicht-josephinischen Inhalt kommt jedenfalls der Stil nicht in Betracht,' the translator is not justified in talking of the 'non-Josephine [sic] character of the contents.' Again (i. 2, 101 n.), 'this correspondence does not occur (scheint) to be identical.' We have collected other instances, but these will suffice. Why, again, must such words as 'conservers' (i. i. 287) or 'undependable' (i. i. 199) be allowed, or such constructions as (i. i. 181) 'His rights and claims were heired by his son,' or (i. i. 402 n., and i. 2, 103) 'Antony had gifted to her the kingdom of Chalcis'? We might also fairly ask not to have such names as Athenäus, Euchärus, Beveregius, Esdrelon. We have said above that the revision seems to have been hasty. Hence we get 'a lay extract' (i. 1, 86) which a reference to the German shows to be a misprint for 'long'; hence (i. i. 190 n.) Ammorites (sic) for Ammonites of the German; hence (i. 1, 40) would for should; hence (i. i. 257), treatises for treaties (Verträge); hence (i. 1, 284) such English as 'even still more fragmentary is the reports which have come down to us'; hence (i. 2, 91), overweaning. We have also noticed one or two small mistakes in the Greek (e.g. on i. i. 433), and the pointing of the Hebrew (i. 1, 134 n.) should be מה and not מה. In a work of such extent we could have forgiven mistakes of this last kind, even if they had been more numerous than as a matter of fact they are. It is only fair to add that we have tested the references, of which there are very many, without finding any wrong ones, and that all the mistakes we have noticed put together detract but slightly from the great service done in making such a book accessible to the English public. One can but regret that blemishes which offend the eye and the ear, and irritate the perception of the readerblemishes, moreover, which might so easily have been either avoided altogether or corrected-should be allowed to mar the pages of so serviceable a work of reference. We cannot doubt that a second edition will before long be required, and we hope that the English translation will before then be subjected to a thorough revision, and that the defects to which we have drawn attention, and others like them, will be removed.

The Church in Relation to Sceptics: a Conversational Guide to Evidential Work. By the Rev. Alex. J. Harrison, B.D., Vicar of Lightcliffe, Evidential Missioner of the Church Parochial Mission Society, Lecturer of the Christian Evidence Society, Boyle Lecturer 1892-3, Author of Problems of Christianity and Scepticism, &c. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1892.)

WE very cordially welcome another volume from the author of *Problems of Christia vity and Scepticism* upon that branch of Christian

XUM

Oct.

from

B.C.,

They

ness.

hich

vriter '

nhalt

not

con-

occur

s' (i.

strucson,

king-

ames

above

a lay

be a

mmo-

ice (i.

Engcome

oticed

nd the

In a

is last

ter of

ences,

s, and

t but

acceswhich

ader-

voided

of so

second English

n, and

rs like

uide to

, Vicar

rochial

society,

ity and

1892.)

of Pro-

ristian

apologetics which he has made peculiarly his own. The book before us is designed to be a sequel to the Problems, and resembles it in many of its most marked characteristics. Like its predecessor it is essentially a full book and is written from a full heart. Mr. Harrison is possessed by strong convictions that evidential work is greatly needed at the present day, and that it must mainly be done by the parochial clergy. To aid in equipping them for this task by helping them to use most deftly the knowledge they already possess, and by further offering them such counsels as his own long and varied experience suggests, is the raison d'être of this 'Conversational Guide.' No apology assuredly was needed for the book itself, nor for its modest title, from one who has worked so hard and so successfully in this trying sphere of labour. Ten hours daily upon an average of many years have been taken up by the production of this and other books conjointly with ordinary duties; but no measure of time can represent the cost of that passage through deep waters of doubt and agony by which, in Mr. Harrison's own case, a clear grasp of truth was reached, and with it an unquenchable sympathy with all others

upon whom a like darkness has fallen.

This personal experience naturally gives its colour to all that Mr. Harrison writes, and doubtless prompts his urgent insistence upon the necessity that the Christian apologist should before all things understand his antagonist's position. This point once mastered the next duty is to deal with it in a thoroughly scientific manner. method of science, or what has been believed (often mistakenly) to be such, has been the sheet anchor of infidelity. The failure of Christian teachers to comprehend wherein scientific method consists has been the one main cause of their apparent inferiority and of that lack of grip in their reply to objections which so many Christian bystanders have deplored. Alike to comprehend his opponent's standpoint and to maintain his own position, the champion of Christianity must grasp 'the method of science,' and the necessary apparatus for this preparation will seem to many readers sufficiently formidable. An adequate understanding of 'the method of science.' although within the reach of any intelligent student, is not to be acquired without thought and pains. By way of direct practical instruction Mr. Harrison advises that it should be gathered from such books as Jevons's Elementary Logic and Jevons's Principles of Science in comparison with Hamilton, Mill, and the second volume of Spencer's Psychology. This would suffice to 'put any young man on the right track' (p. 11). After this preliminary training the débutant may commence a full study of the 'subsidiary evidences,' and 'only ignorance itself can deny the magnificent and enduring work that has been done in this field ' (p. 57). We have not space to quote in full the three separate dozens of books from three separate points of view, of which some are commended as requisite 'to be read again and again, thoroughly grasped, and constantly remembered. That the lists are well worth the attention of all who would be adequately armed for the fray may be seen from the following extract, which supplies the first list :-

R 2

o

th

th

th

th

0

th

03

th

e

ar

S

pi

th

ar

II

th

18

pl

th

Fig. Sir William Hamilton's Metaphysics and Logic. 2. Herbert Spencer's First Principles, Psychology, and Classification of the Sciences. 3. Mill's Logic. 4. Jevons's Principles of Science. 5. Grove's Correlation of Forces and Balfour Stewart's Conservation of Energy. 6. Wallace on Natural Selection. 7. Stewart and Tait's Unseen Universe, 8. Max Müller's Science of Religion. 9. Kennedy's Natural Theology and Modern Thought, with Sir George Stokes's Natural Theology. 10. De Pressensé's Study of Origins. 11. Aubrey Moore's Science and Faith, with Temple's Relations between Religion and Science. 12. Lux Mundi' (pp. 57-8).

Should any reader find this list too wide Mr. Harrison will suggest how it may be best curtailed. But when it is remembered that there are two dozen more to follow, and those too such as will equally tax time and brain, it will be seen that there is scope enough and variety enough to occupy all the mental powers a Christian teacher can bring to his task.

Of course it is not suggested that one man, even though a specialist, should digest all these lists before venturing to enter the arena, but Mr. Harrison's book is at once an example of the width of knowledge required of a modern defender of the faith and a striking illustration of the valuable use to which such knowledge may be put. 'His first book deals with Method and explains the object of evidential work, the causes of unbelief, evidential agencies, arguments in general, and the function of evidence' (p. 5). The remainder of the work consists of illustrations of the method set forth in the opening chapters, and the author is thus led to define and describe the various forms of secularism and unbelief, as well as to distinguish between the different sources from which doubt may spring—a diagnosis of no small importance for its successful treatment.

It would be impossible within the limits of a short notice to give a full example of Mr. Harrison's closely condensed reasoning. Not unfrequently he applies the Socratic method with telling effect, and convinces the objector how largely by his own admission he accepts the Christian premises. A marked feature of his style is the multitude of terse, clean-cut aphorisms which sparkle on his pages. Here are a few, selected almost at random :- 'I take it for granted that our object is not so much to answer objections as it is to save the objectors' (p. 14). 'It is certain that the reasons given for scepticism are often, to all appearance, not only inadequate but absurd. But then a thing that is very weak as a reason may be very powerful as 'There is need of great care in distinguishing sin a cause' (p. 15). as universal disablement of faculty from sin as voluntary neglect of duty' (p. 21). 'The worst unbelievers are those who pretend to be Christians' (p. 22). 'Some of the best men I know seem to have nailed up one or two of the doors at which truth stands knocking with sad persistence' (p. 44). 'Extremists on the one side reduce everything to consciousness, extremists on the other reduce everything to force; it is for us, while recognizing both as manifestations of one God, to insist that consciousness as well as force shall be taken into account and truly interpreted' (p. 45). 'Arguments will not make God visible to the soul, any more than "optics" will fill the eye with

erbert
iences.
rrelaWaliverse,
eology
ology,
ce and
Lux

Oct.

iggest there ly tax ariety bring

gh a

er the width and a e may object arguinder in the scribe guish a dia-

give Not t, and cepts nulti-Here at our e obicism But ful as ng sin ect of to be have g with

everying to of one into make with light' (p. 49), 'Our ultimate certainty is not that of reason, but of faith, except as, in their roots, the two are one' (p. 72). 'In certain cases agnosticism is bewilderment of faculty rather than conviction of uncertainity' (p. 140). But we must hold our hand, although we had marked above a score more of like morceaux for quotation. Even these, in this scattered and disjointed fashion, may serve to illustrate the temper of their author and his power to 'discern between things that differ.'

Whilst, however, we express our unfeigned admiration for much that is contained in *The Church in Relation to Sceptics*, we must not be understood as accepting unreservedly all that its author advances. On certain deep questions to which he refers—e.g. the exact nature of our Blessed Lord's human knowledge—we think it better to wait for that fuller light which we doubt not will yet be granted us. Yet such exceptions need not prevent our hearty admiration for the learning, the eloquence, and the loving Christian spirit which shine out on every page. Specially notable is the writer's testimony that truth as held by the Catholic Church is the one secure stronghold against which scepticism wars in vain. No one can follow this 'Conversational Guide' carefully without recognizing the practical judgment of its author and his complete mastery of his difficult and complex theme. And, we may add, no one could have written such a volume who was not himself largely gifted with the qualities, both intellectual and moral, on whose importance Mr. Harrison so earnestly insists.

The Wisdom and Wit of Blessed Thomas More; being Extracts from such of his Works as were written in English, collected and edited by the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT, C.S.S.R., Author of Life of Blessed Thomas More, &c. (London: Burns and Oates, 1892).

This book forms a welcome supplement to Father Bridgett's Life of Sir Thomas More, already reviewed in these columns. We then expressed a hope, in common with many other of the writer's critics, that a complete library edition of the great scholar's works might soon be given to the world. The general expression of this desiremoved Father Bridgett to publish the present selection from More's English Works in the hope that the volume might at once hasten the wished-for reprint, and meanwhile serve as a sample both of his matter and manner. This collection, however, does not include any of those memorable passages from More's different writings that appeared in the Life, and is intended as a companion to the former work.

Father Bridgett prefaces his selection with an 'Essay on the Wisdom and Wit of Blessed Thomas,' the substance of which formed the subject of two lectures delivered by the author in Chelsea in 1890 and 1891. After glancing briefly at the chief events of More's life, and pointing out how from his boyhood he had imbibed that philosophy of time and eternity which governed his whole course, the writer dwells on the wit that was so marked a characteristic of his genius. Erasmus, his dearest friend, says that More's handsome face seemed always ready for mirth, and describes him as 'insignis'

18

OI

SI

W

SI

W

in

nugator,' a famous lover of fun, and one who could be all things to all men, whose company and conversation increased joy, dissipated dulness, and soothed sorrow. Throughout his life he was distinguished for this strange mixture of joyousness and seriousness, of boyish fun and saintly earnestness, of merriment and pathos. And at every page of his writings we are struck by the lively fancy, richness of illustration, and shrewd sarcasm there displayed.

In that beautiful 'Dialogue of Comfort in Tribulation,' which he wrote during the weary months of his captivity in the Tower, he himself defends the use of mirth, and fitness of witty terms in writing or speaking on spiritual subjects.

'A merry tale with a friend refresheth a man much, and without any harm lighteneth his mind and amendeth his courage; so that it seemeth but well done to take such recreation. And Solomon saith, "I trow that men should in heaviness give the sorry man wine to make him forget his sorrow." And St. Thomas saith, "that proper, pleasanttalking, which is called εὐτραπελία, is a good virtue, serving to refresh the mind and make it quick and lusty to labour and study again, where continual fatigation would make it dull and deadly. . . . " A certain holy father, in making of a sermon, spake of heaven and heavenly things so celestially that much of his audience, with the sweet sound thereof, began to forget all the world and fall asleep. Which, when the father beheld, he dissembled their sleeping, and suddenly said unto them, "I shall tell you a merry tale," at which word they lifted up their heads and hearkened unto that. And after the sleep therewith broken, heard him tell on of heaven again. ... So he that cannot long endure to hold up his head and hear talking of heaven, except he be now and then between (as though heaven were heaviness) refreshed with a merry, foolish tale, there is none other remedy, but you must let him have it. Better would I wish it, but I cannot help it' (pp. 15-17).

But this love of merriment was an altogether different thing from levity. No one took a more serious view of life, or ever insisted more strongly than More did on the perils of leading an idle and self-pleasing life, 'drawing away the days with dancing or some such other goodly gaming'—the word here signifies pastime or amusement. God sent men into this world to wake and work, and sleep and pleasure must only serve for refreshment and recreation, just as we use sauce to increase our appetite.

'And, therefore, likewise as it were a fond feast that had all the table full of sauce, and so little meat therewith, that the guests should go thence as empty as they came thither; so is it surely a very mad ordered life that hath but little time bestowed in any fruitful business, and all the substance idly spent in play' (p. 13).

When taking leave of his friends More was often heard to say, 'God grant we may meet in heaven, and be merry ever after.' And that last most touching letter which he wrote with a charred stick to his beloved daughter Margaret the night before his execution ends with the words: 'Farewell, my dear child, and pray for me, as I shall for you and all your friends, that we may merrily meet in heaven.' This use of the word is perhaps the best explanation of what he understood by merriment.

nings to sipated

guished

rish fun t every

ness of

nich he

ver, he

writing

out any

ow that

rget his

which is d make igation

ly that

embled

to that.

again.

king of

n were

, but I

g from

nsisted

e and

e such

muse-

sleep

ust as

e table uld go

rdered

nd all

to say, And

ick to

n ends

, as I

et in

\*Father Bridgett divides his collection into five parts. The first, or Ascetic passages—that is to say, the selections from More's devotional works—are chiefly drawn from the 'Dialogue of Comfort' and other meditations composed in the Tower. Many treat of death, and show how present the thought was to his mind in these days, in spite of the cheerful and encouraging way in which he spoke and wrote to his daughter and his friends. This is how he speaks of sinful man's fear of death, and of the saint's desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better:

'Of him that is loth to leave this wretched world, mine heart is much in fear lest he die not well. Hard it is for him to be welcome that cometh against his will, that saith to God when he cometh to Him, "Welcome my Maker, maugre my teeth." But he that so loveth Him that he longeth to go to Him, my heart cannot give me, but he shall be welcome, all were it so, that he should come, ere he were well purged. For charity covereth a multitude of sins, and he that trusteth in God cannot be confounded. And Christ saith, "He that cometh to Me, I will not cast him out." And therefore let us never make our reckoning of long life; keep it while we may, because God hath so commanded, but if God give the occasion that with His good will we may go, let us be glad thereof and long to go to Him' (p. 73).

So he wrote on the eve of his execution, but the same thoughts were in his mind in the days of health and prosperity, when as long ago as 1515 he described the way in which the inhabitants of Utopia regarded death. In their eyes it is a boon and not a calamity, and it is better to be taken to God, even by a violent death, than to be kept long from His Presence by the most prosperous course of life.

'Though they are compassionate to all that are sick, yet they lament no man's death, except they see him loath to part with life. They think that such a man's appearance before God cannot be acceptable to Him who being called on does not go out cheerfully, but is backward and unwilling, and is, as it were, dragged to it. They are struck with horror when they see any die in this manner, and carry them out in silence and with sorrow, and praying God that He would be merciful to the errors of the departed soul, they lay the body in the ground; but when any die cheerfully and full of hope they do not mourn for them, but sing hymns when they carry out their bodies, commending their souls very earnestly to God' (p. 6).

The remainder of Father Bridgett's book, although divided into different chapters, and classed under the separate heads of 'Dogmatic,' 'Illustrative of the Period,' 'Fancies,' 'Sports and Merry Tales,' and 'Colloquial and Quaint Phrases,' consists almost exclusively of passages from More's controversial writings. In all this class of writing, and more especially in his 'Confutation of Tyndale' and the 'Dialogues,' he gives free rein to his love of satire, and delights in illustrating his argument or confuting his opponents by means of quaint stories and similes. He compares the heretical doctors who obscure the plain language of the Bible by a constant reference to the most difficult passages, to the blind guides who put out the candle when men are walking on a dark night, and

seek other means of finding the way. And he likens the different sects of heretics to a company of mocking knaves who, meeting a poor traveller who asks the way to the nearest town, speak all at once, and each of them tells him 'This way!' each of them at the same time pointing with his hand a different way (p. 232).

He ridicules Luther's declaration that it was unlawful for any Christian to fight against the Turk or to resist him, though he come with a great army and destroy all, as a saying that reminds him of the old sage father-fool in Kent, who ascribed the decay of Sandwich Haven to the building of Tenterden steeple. A meeting of wise men of Kent had been called to discover the cause of the sands and shoals which had risen and choked up the harbour, rendering it practically useless for all but quite small vessels. After various reasons had been suggested, one good old father started up, exclaiming, 'Yea, masters, say every man what he will, I've marked this matter well as some other, and by God I wot how it waxed naught well enough. For I knew it good, and have marked when it began to wax worse.' Upon which the other gentlemen inquired eagerly what the cause might be. 'By my faith, masters,' quoth he, 'yonder same Tenterden steeple, and nothing else, that, by the mass, I would it were a fair fish-pole.' The others looked at the speaker greatly perplexed in mind, and inquired anxiously how the church-tower could have hurt the haven. 'Nay, by Our Lady, masters,' the old fool replied, 'I cannot tell you rely, but I wot well it hath. For, by God, I knew it a good haven till that steeple was builded, and by the Mary-mass I've marked it well, it never throve since' (p. 188).

Another saying of Luther which had provoked More's indignation was the wish he expressed in one of his sermons that he had in his hand all the pieces of the Holy Cross, so that he might throw them there as never sun should shine upon them. The reason he gave for this vindictiveness was the waste of money that was spent in garnishing the pieces of the Cross with gold, instead of giving it to the poor; as though, More exclaims, this gold would not have failed to be given to the poor, and nothing were lost but what is spent on Christ's Cross! Luther's argument is an old one, and has been used in every generation by a certain class of philanthropists and niggards, who grudge every penny that is spent on the decoration of God's altars, and ask the disciples' old question, 'To what purpose is this waste?' Sir Thomas More, mindful of the lavish expenditure at Henry VIII.'s court, and with the memory of the idle splendour he had lately witnessed on the Field of the Cloth of Gold still fresh

in his recollection, remarks truly enough:-

'How small a portion were the gold about all the pieces of Christ's Cross if it were compared with the gold that is quite cast away about the gilding of knives, swords, spurs, arras and painted clothes, and, as though these things could not consume gold fast enough, the gilding of posts and whole roses, not only in the palaces of princes and great prelates, but also many right mean men's houses. And yet among all these things could Luther spy no gold that grievously glittered in his bleared eyes, but only about the Cross of Christ. For that gold, if it

were ! of gol they r or in l

T

1892

praise nation his U lamer reluct and h But h respec mean was a the gr had th Every most one o article his st to a l hearti friend in the which very f truth kings they i draw will t reque Ladis his se when witho wise ;

M cellor folk v ways infini make and h there with ! preac were taken thence, this wise man weeneth it would be strait given to poor men; and that, when he daily seeth that such as have their purse full of gold give to the poor not one piece thereof. But if they give aught, they ransack the bottom among all the gold to seek out here a halfpenny, or in his country a brass penny, whereof four make a farthing '(p. 143).

The flattery with which kings were surrounded and the fulsome praises of their courtiers was another topic that roused More's indignation, and at which some of his most pointed shafts are aimed. In his Utopia he repeatedly dwells on this aspect of court life, and laments the boastful pride and vainglory of princes. We know how reluctantly he allowed himself to be drawn into the king's service, and how much he suffered from the 'laborious triflings of princes.' But he is just as severe on the weakness of great prelates in this respect, and tells a story of their love of flattery which is evidently meant to apply to Cardinal Wolsey. He once knew a bishop, who was a great man not only in the Church but also in the state, one of the greatest indeed in all his land, and glorious far above all measure, had this weakness, that he was never satisfied of hearing his own praise. Every act and word of his was received by those around him with the most slavish adulation, and none dared speak the truth to him. one occasion he drew up a treaty with a foreign prince, and devised the articles so wisely and well that he knew all the world would commend his statesmanship. But in his longing for praise he showed the treaty to a learned friend and asked him how he liked it, begging him heartily to tell him the very truth. He spoke so earnestly that his friend was deceived, and told him honestly that there was one point in the scheme which in his opinion ought to be altered. which the great man swore in great anger, 'By the mass! thou art a very fool!' After that his friend was careful never to tell him the truth again. From which incident More draws this moral, that if kings and men in high position are really anxious to hear the truth they must make much of those who are honest with them, and withdraw their confidence from them that falsely flatter them, and they will thus attain their object more surely than by making twenty requests to others that they would tell them true. As good King Ladislaus, of happy memory, was wont to say when he saw that any of his servants praised him without reason: 'I pray thee, good fellow, when thou sayest grace at my board, never bring in Gloria Patri without a sicut erat; that is to wit, even as it was, and none otherwise; and lift me not up with no lies, for I love it not' (p. 216).

Many are the quaint tales and pithy sayings of the great Chancellor that Father Bridgett has here collected. The simple country folk were full of charm for him, and he is never tired of noting their ways and doings, while the rude homeliness of their speech affords him infinite amusement. There is that good man Grime, the mustard-maker in Cambridge, who was wont to pray for himself and his wife and his child, and grace to make good mustard, and no more; and there is the poor wife of the parish whom the friar caught whispering with her pew-fellow in the middle of his sermon, upon which the preacher, falling into a great rage, cried out to her aloud:

"Hold thy babble, I bid thee, thou wife in the red hood!" Which, when the housewife heard, she waxed as angry again, and suddenly she started up, and cried out unto the friar again, that all the church rang thereon: "Marry, Sir, I beshrew his heart that babbleth most of us both, for I do but whisper a word with my neighbour here, and thou hast babbled here all this hour" (p. 185).

But no one had a deeper reverence for the simple piety of the poor and humble, or appreciated its beauty more fully than More. We must end our extracts with a passage in which he speaks beautifully of this knowledge of the simple. He is giving an explanation of the meaning of the word Housel, or sacrifice, commonly used before the Reformation for the Blessed Sacrament of the altar. The word is used by Shakspeare in the famous lines where he describes Hamlet's father as cut off by a sudden and violent death, and sent to meet his God 'Unhousel'd, disappointed, unanel'd.'

'The name of Housel doth not only signify unto us the blessed Body and Blood of our Lord in the sacramental form, but also—like as this English word God signifieth unto us, not only the Unity of the Godhead, but also the Trinity of the Three Persons, and not only their supersubstantial substance, but also every gracious property, as Justice, Mercy, Truth, Almightiness, Eternity, and every good thing more than we can imagine—so doth unto us English folk this English word Housel, though not express, yet imply, and under a reverent devout silence signify, both the sacramental signs and the sacramental things, as well the things contained as the things holily signified, with all the secret unsearchable mysteries of the same. All which holy things, right many persons very little learned, but yet in grace godly minded, with heart humble and religious, not arrogant, proud, and curious, under the name of holy Housel, with inward heavenly comfort, do full devoutly reverence. As many a good, poor, simple, unlearned soul honoureth God full devoutly under the name of God, that cannot yet tell such a tale of God as some great clerks can, that are yet, for lack of like devotion, nothing near so much in God's grace and favour' (p. 32).

Father Bridgett has done a good work in bringing these specimens of the wit and wisdom of Sir Thomas More within the reach of general readers. We heartily commend his book to all who wish to become more closely acquainted with the writings of this admirable man, whose genius, in the opinion of Erasmus, stood far above that of any other Englishmen of his day, and who (in those words of his that form so apt a motto to the present volume) was undoubtedly well 'furnyshed of one speciall thynge, without which all lernynge is halfe lame. What is that? quoth he. Marry, quoth I, a good mother wyt' ('Dialogues,' p. 153).

The Church in Spain. By FREDERICK MEYRICK, Rector of Blickling and non-residentiary Canon of Lincoln. 'The National Churches' Series, edited by P. H. Ditchfield. (London: Wells, Gardner, Darton, and Co., 1892.)

THE series entitled 'The National Churches' will do good service if it tends to dispel the popular but absurd and utterly unhistorical notion that the Churches of Western Christendom may be grouped

sub only the bee -t Chu spre und we not quit for ano tran larg all i for cen Spa hav

189

und

inst

divi

the

Subj Eng Soc rally in S cour pred to n to E betw in S prea of c

with

to d

port

ther

were sive in C beer fore all-a its o

than

she rang f us hast

Oc

the the d is let's his

Body

this ead, perercy, can ough both conable very

d reusel, ny a nder great ch in

h of sh to rable at of that well halfe wyt'

kling ches' dner,

ice if orical uped

under one of two heads, 'Protestant' or 'Catholic.' We will not insult our readers' understandings by explaining the fallacy of such a division, but will only ask them to make inquiry for themselves, and they will soon find how prevalent the idea is. If for 'Catholic' we substitute the more correct term 'Roman Catholic,' this in one way only makes confusion worse confounded; for as, from the days of the Apostles, the division of the one Church into many Churches has been a purely geographical one, how can the Roman Catholic Church -that is, the Catholic Church at Rome-be the Anglo-Catholic Church, or the Catholic Church in England? But, like all widelyspread fallacies, this particular fallacy is founded upon a basis of underlying truth. If, instead of 'Protestant' and 'Roman Catholic,' we divided the Churches into those which were and those which were not under the Roman obedience, the division would be theoretically quite correct; but it would be impossible to carry it out practically, for we should find that the same Church at one time was, and at another time was not, under that obedience, and that often the transition period, one way or the other, was so long that it covered a large space of the Church's existence. But there is no difficulty at all in dividing Churches according to nationalities. As there has been for many centuries a Church of Rome, so has there been for many centuries a Church of England, a Church of France, a Church of Spain, which at different periods of their history have been, and have not been, under the obedience of Rome. We have now to do with the national Church of Spain, of which Canon Meyrick is in this volume the very competent historian. It has been our misfortune to differ in toto from the writer's sentiments on one of the most important subjects which can engage the attention of a Christian; it therefore gives us all the more pleasure to be able to say that on the subject before us he is more entitled to write than, perhaps, any living His long connexion with the Anglo-Continental Englishman. Society and his intimate acquaintance with foreign Churches generally enable him to speak with authority on the history of the Church in Spain, a history which is very little known in England. It is, of course, impossible within our short space to attempt anything like a précis of what is itself a closely condensed history. It must suffice to notice one or two points which appear to be especially interesting to Englishmen. The first is the curious analogy in many respects between the circumstances of the Church in England and the Church in Spain in past times. Both trace their legendary origin to the preaching of the same great Apostle of the Gentiles, though there are of course better grounds for believing that St. Paul visited Spain, than for believing that he visited Britain. Both, in their early stages, were strictly national, not only in the sense that they were co-extensive with the nation, but in the sense that the national government in Church and State was united to an extent to which it has rarely been since or elsewhere. Both owed it to the results of a wave of foreign conquest passing over them that they at last yielded to the all-absorbing power of Rome. And as the Church of England owed its organization mainly to one man, Archbishop Theodore, so did the

Church of Spain to one man, Bishop Hosius-the greatest name, Canon Meyrick thinks, to be found in its annals. Happily the parallel does not extend to the later history of the two Churches. The horrors of the Inquisition, which are graphically described in this volume, were never known in England; the English Church cannot always be vindicated from the charge of cruelty and persecution; but the bluff honesty of the English mind has always revolted from anything that looks like a stab in the dark; and so the Holy Office, and Torquemada, and Philip II. were tolerated in Spain, but intolerable in England. On the other hand there was a form of piety to the good points of which Canon Meyrick scarcely appears to us to do full justice, which found a congenial soil in Spain, but which could never interweave itself with the coarser texture of the English mind. We refer, of course, to what is vaguely termed Mysticism, the extremest type of which is found in St. Theresa and St. John of the The Spanish Mystics, whose writings still possess a strange fascination for minds of a certain cast, could, perhaps, scarcely claim a prominent place in a work which has exclusively to do with the national Church of Spain, for it is of the essence of Mysticism to dwell apart from national life; but they are to us the most interesting products of that Church. But should not a little more space have been given to the Society of Jesus, the father of which was a Spaniard? The Church of Spain was not rich in great names; but surely Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier would have been great names in any Church-far greater, to our mind, than Hosius and Julian and Isidore, whose fame is now but little known beyond the boundaries of the Pyrenees. We freely admit, however, that the fame of the latter should be better known, and we have to thank Canon Meyrick for his full information on this as on many other points: the wild legends which connect the Church of Spain with its patron, St. James, the histories of the numerous-seventeen, if not eighteen-Councils of Toledo, which were quite free from all Roman interference, of the Mozarabic Liturgy, and of the long contest between Mahommedanism and Christianity, which was nowhere more thoroughly fought out than in Spain, have in no English work with which we are acquainted been so clearly described as in the volume before us.

For King and Country; or, Kintail Place. By JANE A. NUTT. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1891.)

The writer of this book has successfully accomplished the extremely difficult, but, when well done, extremely interesting, and, we may add, valuable work of producing a good historical tale. It is the fashion to run down historical novels; but, after all, how many people owe their knowledge of past times more to such books as Esmond, Dorothy Foster, and the Waverleys, than to professed histories! The danger, of course, is lest the writer should so mix upfact and fiction that it is difficult for a reader to disentangle them; but there is no fear lest any reader of ordinary intelligence should fall into this trap in the present case. The subject is a most fasci-

nating ceive is tha be at tale; the to Vend autho flicted times must, ing to the h term) three graph conte publi befor episo It sh that a of R Vend the n and 1 cover the b of th well: write strug cruel her o and i givin perio read Chu

1892

many frequence there been Englander we have comfained

this hero

write

Det.

me,

the

ies.

in

an-

n:

om

ice,

ble

the

do

uld

nd.

ex-

the

nge

iim

the

sm

er-

ace

s a

but

eat

ind

the

the

ink

her

rith

not

nan

be-

ore

rith

me

on-

ely

the

any

as nisup

m :

uld

sci-

nating but very sad one; and the only objection which we can conceive any competent person making against For King and Country is that it is too full of horrors. This objection, however, would not be at all obviated by having recourse to grave history rather than to a tale; for we do not believe that the author has one whit exaggerated the terrible cruelties perpetrated upon the brave peasants of La Vendée, who rose up for king and country against the self-constituted authorities who in the name of liberty, equality, and fraternity inflicted upon France, at the close of the last century, sufferings ten times worse than those from which they professed to deliver it. must, however, warn the reader that if he takes up this book expecting to find it a love story, like most novels, he will be disappointed; the heroine is married and done for (in too literal a sense of the term) before the first quarter of the book is ended; in the remaining three-quarters there is no love-making at all, but simply a vivid and graphic account, told in a simple but pure and scholarly style, of the contest between the peasants of La Vendée and the short-lived republican government of France, after the execution of the king and before the rise of the Emperor Napoleon Buonaparte. It is an episode in French history which well deserves to be carefully studied. It shows, among other things, that it is an utter mistake to suppose that all sense of religion had died out in France when the Goddess of Reason was set up for worship in Paris; for the war in La Vendée arose quite as much from religious as from patriotic grounds; the noble-minded peasants and their masters—for in this matter noble and peasant worked hand in hand-were quite as much bent upon recovering their religion as upon recovering the monarchy, and no part of the book is more interesting than that which describes the simple piety of the Royalists, who found their best consolation under reverses, as well as their best hopes of success, in the offices of the Church. The writer only does justice to the influence for good exercised during the struggle by the French clergy, whose characters have, we believe, been cruelly maligned. To prevent misconception it should be added that her own views are those of an English Churchwoman of the best type; and it is not the least part of the value of her book that, besides giving a good account of French history at one of its most exciting periods, it is also calculated to strengthen the attachment of the reader to that 'pure and Apostolic branch of the Holy Catholic Church established in these realms.' An extract will at once prove this point and give a good specimen of the author's style. heroine, who in this question clearly represents the views of the writer, says-

'It had been a great sorrow to my dear John and myself to be, for so many months, cut off from all sacramental means of grace. We used frequently to be present at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, but there all ended for us. Although I was French by descent, yet I had been brought up a daughter of the Holy Catholic Church as existing in England. Nothing would have induced either of us to tamper with what we had been taught. Often, when I went into a church to get some comfort for my poor aching heart, I have been spoken to by one of the kind Vendéen priests, and oh! how have I wished that he had been one

1892

the pi

of our own Communion, one to whom I might have poured forth my heart's sorrows. But my great-grandmother Mackenzie, an English Talbot by birth, had been under the spiritual direction of the holy Bishop Ken in her early youth. All the lessons which she learned from him had been faithfully transmitted to my dear grandmother, and through her to me, most unworthy. And earnestly she had besought me never on any consideration, under any pretext, to desert the Church into which I had, by God's providence, been baptized, the Church which Bishop Ken had taught her mother was the purest on earth, the nearest to the doctrine of the Apostles' (pp. 189–95).

Whether the heroine of the book, who is supposed to tell the tale, always represents the opinions of the writer we cannot, of course, say; but if she does we should demur to some of her views. She takes, for instance, a far more favourable estimate of the Bourbon kings than they appear to us to deserve; nor can we altogether acquiesce in her severe strictures upon the English Government for not taking a more promptand energetic part in aiding the French Royalists. But we will not argue these points; for, after all, it is undoubtedly true to history that a thoroughgoing partisan of the Royalists, into whose mouth the opinions are put, should hold them in the strongest possible form.

Lay Sermons for Practical People. Edited by the Rev. FREEMAN WILLS. (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh. No date.)

WHEN we say that this book consists of twenty addresses delivered by fifteen different persons on Sunday afternoons at the Lambeth Polytechnic Institute, the reader will be prepared for a somewhat heterogeneous volume. The Conduct of Life and the Health of the Mind : the Religious Aspects of Science and the Revelation of Evening; Physical Training and Moral Courage; the Drama in White and Blue and the Relations of the Church and the Stage; Sentiment and Music and Funeral Reform-to quote no other titles-cover a wide field and furnish a varied programme. Amongst the clergy who took part we find Mr. Shuttleworth and Canon Barker, besides the editor. The Nonconformist ministers are represented by Mr. Gynon Lewis and Mr. Arthur Mursell. Sir John Lubbock and Dr. W. B. Richardson, Dr. Danford Thomas and Mr. Lant Carpenter, and their other lay associates are men well known for scientific acquirements or for earnest effort in the cause of social reform. One lady only, Miss Patteson, is included in the list, and her two addresses on Moral Courage, as exemplified in the lives of Bishops Patteson and Selwyn, stand out in strong relief for their unaffected simplicity and the speaker's well-founded assurance that the plain, unvarnished tale of these heroes of the Cross would, without artistic adornment, touch the hearts of those who heard it.

A bare résumé of twenty sermons is, of course, impracticable within the limits of a short notice, but their inclusion within one cover brings out prominently the truth that variety of style means variety of character. 'Le style c'est l'homme' is written on every page of the Lay Sermons. The plain, straightforward utterance of

ceptan treasu the ill with 1 obviot disfigu to the as illu be. Blue' for th and the moral music to wil Mr. ] schoo trast of fre Mag of th into days and a (p. 2 influ calui Cano grati Sir J drew mixe of a table form appr Shao with men glari as v wou the

so n

Pala

botl

mar

Wil

ct.

ny

sh

ly

m

gh

er

ch

op

ne

e,

e,

ie

n

C-

ot

S.

C

st

N

0

d

h

d

d

.

2

e

1,

y

S

1

the preacher, lay or clerical, who is bent upon compassing the acceptance of the truth he wants to urge, and who brings out of the treasure of a well-informed mind and an honest heart the facts and the illustrations necessary for his purpose, stands in marked contrast with the poverty alike of matter and of thought, and with the obvious straining after the applause of the groundlings which disfigure some of the addresses. As examples we should point to the lectures by Mr. Henry Arthur Jones and Canon Barker as illustrations of what such lay sermons should and should not Mr. Jones's address, quaintly called 'The Drama in White and Blue'--' colours signifying the qualities which all art should possess, for the white did signify gladness, pleasure, delight, and rejoicing, and the blue celestial things' (p. 159)—is a model of strong, earnest moral teaching upon the lowering tendency of many theatres and music halls, so well put as to arrest and fix itself upon the memory, to win the judgment, and to elevate the soul. In his horror of cant Mr. Jones need not be afraid of using words that recall the Sundayschool teacher, for they are fellow-workers in the same field. trast with this Canon Barker's address on 'Music,' with its entire lack of freshness or depth of thought, with its atrocious taste (he calls the Magnificat the 'Marseillaise' of the Church of God [p. 17]-the hymn of the Blessed Virgin, sweetest type of all purity and lowliness, brought into comparison with the war-shriek of the Revolution's bloodiest days!), with its absurd truisms—e.g. that 'people would not be listless and asleep if their minds were interested and their hearts engaged' (p. 20), and that 'man is a human being, governed by ordinary laws, influenced by his nature' (p. 18)—with its swaggering vulgarity and calumny-'we who have the honour of dining once a year with the Canons and Dean of St. Paul's know how they are always congratulating themselves on their improved congregations, but it was Sir John Stainer's introducing those beautiful services which first drew the people to St. Paul's' (p. 19). What a charming lesson for the mixed audience at the Lambeth Polytechnic! What an opportunity of advertizing one's self as admitted to the Dean and Chapter's table, and repaying them by proclaiming to a Lambeth crowd the information, gleaned through their hospitality, that they are constantly appropriating to themselves the credit which belongs to another. Shades of Church, Liddon, and Lightfoot, how Canon Barker's sneers wither at the thought of you; let Sir John Stainer forgive his compli-The remaining lectures are at least free from such ments if he can. glaring blemishes. Most of them are really able and useful as well as well-fitted in style and temper for this class of audience, and they would furnish admirable matter for parochial evening gatherings in the coming winter. Whether we are doing wisely in sweeping aside so many old endowments and sinking such vast sums in our People's Palaces, or whether it is quite desirable to deliver lay sermons in them on Sunday afternoons, are questions we do not touch on. If both are answered in the affirmative we should congratulate the managers who secured so good a course as this which Mr. Freeman Wills has given to the world.

Six Months in the Apennines; or, a Pilgrimage in Search of Vestiges of the Irish Saints in Italy. With Numerous Illustrations. By MARGARET STOKES, Honorary Member of the Royal Irish Academy, Associate of the Scottish Society of Antiquaries, &c., Author of Early Christian Architecture in Ireland, &c. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1892.)

THE title of this book should of itself be enough to attract a large circle of readers. There is no more delightful and interesting region in Italy than this mountainous district, with its hill-set villages and ancient sanctuaries, its noble forests and castellated heights, where every step recalls some stirring record of mediæval days and brings back the poet's words—

'What I love best in all the world Is a castle precipice-encurled, In a gash of the wind-grieved Apennine.'

And the author of Six Months in the Apennines had a distinct purpose in view, which gives additional interest to this record of her wanderings over Lombard plains and Tuscan hills. The object of her journey, as we learn from the title of her book, was to search out the personal relics and memorials of Irish saints in this part of Italy, and at the same time find a clue to the origins of Irish art, which might throw light on the development of certain styles in Ireland. No one could have been better fitted for the task than Miss Stokes, whose thorough knowledge of Irish antiquities, and genuine enthusiasm for Celtic art and history, are already well known to

readers of her former work on Early Irish Architecture.

Her account of the constant intercourse which took place between Ireland and Italy in the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, and of the traces that still remain in the churches and monasteries of the Apennines of Irish saints, will be new to many readers. Few of us, perhaps, realize that S. Frediano, the great Bishop of Lucca, the founder of the ancient churches in that city which we all go to visit, and the saint whose miracles are commemorated in the pictures of Filippo Lippi and of Francia's pupil, Aspertini, was an Irishman by birth, the son of a king of Ulster. After founding the abbey school of Moville, on Lough Strangford, where Columba was ordained, the fair-haired Finnian, to use his Celtic name, left his native shores for Italy, and settled in a hermitage on Monte Pisano, near Lucca. There his holiness and good works endeared him so much to the people of Lucca that they made him their bishop, and his miracles and charity won many of the idolatrous Lombards over to the faith. Unlike many Christian bishops, he refused to fly before those barbarous invaders, and after they had destroyed Lucca he rebuilt the city walls, restored the cathedral, and founded a new church, which now bears his name. Miss Stokes describes the memorials of the saint still to be found at Lucca and Monte Pisano, in letters from Pisa and Lucca, prefacing her own narrative by the legends of the good bishop as given in the monastic records of the period. follows the same method in dealing with the other Irish saints whose

the s thirty siona with visite the h that i Colu gives Bobi scene saint tury, Anot frien mon

1892

footp place

was
Char
ordir
ingly
hero
succ
of th
the
that
Pavi
quea
his l

mon on a chos coro Cou life dutie he t Rive still

St. 1

ct.

res

By sh

c.,

n-

ge

ng

es

S,

nd

r-

er

of

h

of

t,

in

SS ie

0

n s,

25

W

e

t,

of

y

ol

e r

1.

e

S

1.

e

h

n

e

footprints she has followed, with so much care and love, in other

One of the most interesting chapters in her book is devoted to the story of St. Columban, who left the monastery of Bangor at thirty years of age, and devoted the remainder of his life to missionary labours in Gaul and North Italy. Most of us are familiar with Dr. Maclear's account of this great saint's career, but few have visited the church and monastery of Bobio, which he founded in the heart of the Apennines, and where the little wild flower, Erbilia, that is said to have sprung up on the bare rock in the footsteps of Columban, may still be seen growing. The views which Miss Stokes. gives of the valley of the Trebbia, and the town and bridge of Bobio help us to form some idea of the sublime beauty of the scenery where the church of St. Columban stands, and where the saint himself reposes under a marble sarcophagus of the fifteenth century, adorned with bas-reliefs illustrating the chief events of his life. Another Irishman who lies buried in the crypts of Bobio with those friendly saints of Erin is the learned Dungal, for many years a monk at the abbey of St. Denis, where his reputation for wisdom was so great, that when the sun was twice eclipsed in one year, Charlemagne desired him to write an explanation of this extraordinary phenomenon. The Irish exile, as he calls himself, accordingly addressed an epistle to Charlemagne on the subject, and wrote heroic verses in praise of this mighty prince. One of Charles's successors, the Emperor Lothair, afterwards appointed Dungal master of the public school established by him at Pavia, and which became the famous university that was during many centuries the glory of that city. Of Dungal himself, however, hardly a trace remains at Pavia, and all we know of his connexion with Bobio is that he bequeathed his library to the monastery, and in all probability spent his last years there.

Miss Stokes was more fortunate in tracing out the footprints of St. Donatus, who left in the early years of the ninth century the monastery of Iniscaltra, Holy Island, on Lough Derg, to go forth on a pilgrimage to the tombs of the saints in Italy, and was chosen Bishop of Fiesole in 824. He was present in 843 at the coronation of Louis II. by Pope Sergius in Rome, and again at the Council which met at the Lateran in the year 861. The rest of his life was spent in the most assiduous discharge of his episcopal duties, and he never saw Ireland again; but to the end of his days. he tenderly remembered the old home on the wide water of the River Shannon, and in a prologue to the Life of St. Brigid of Kildare, still preserved in the Laurentian Library, thus recalls the green

shores of Erin:-

'Far in the confines of the west There lies a land, of lands the best, An island, rich in all good store Of robe and gem and golden ore; An isle, in soil and sun and wind Most healthful to the human kind.

VOL. XXXV.-NO. LXIX.

With honey all the land abounds, With lovely lawns and pasture grounds, With weeds of peace and peaceful arts, With arms of war and manly hearts. And, worthy of that blessed spot, There dwell the nations of the Scot, A race of men renowned high For honour, arms, and courtesy.'

The sainted Bishop, to whom nothing in this sweet Tuscan land seemed more lovely than the Emerald Isle, sleeps in the grand old Duomo of Fiesole, surrounded by the fairest sculptures of Renaissance workmanship. An altar has been raised to his memory here, and his feast is yearly kept on October 22. But Donato's name is still more closely associated with the Badia or Abbey of Fiesole, that favourite shrine of the Medici princes, on the lower slopes of 'the beautiful mountain,' as the cypress-crowned heights of Fiesole are described by the saint's chroniclers. For it was to this ancient abbey that the Irish pilgrims first came, on that memorable night when, as they climbed the steep ascent from the valley of the Arno, all the bells rang out and all the lamps burst into sudden light for joy of their appearance. There the citizens of Fiesole enthroned Donato in the bishop's chair, and there he was originally buried, until after the fall of Napoleon in 1814. Bishop Mancini obtained leave to celebrate the occasion by translating his relics to the Duomo, on the top of the hill. The ancient oratory of S. Romolo, the founder of the Badia, where our saint must often have worshipped-a small octagon chapel which figures in Botticelli's great altar-piece of the City of God, now in the National Gallery—was still standing in 1875, when it was pulled down by an ill-judged restorer, as the inscription on a tablet in the wall records 'to add elegance to the church.' So, in these lovely scenes, the memory of the Irish Bishop of Fiesole comes to mingle with the names of Dante, of Boccaccio, of Cosimo and Lorenzo, and the painters and poets of those glorious days; and as we look down the silver windings of Arno, and on the towers of Florence at our feet, we remember the monk of Holy Island who lived here during more than half a century, but never forgot Ireland.

We cannot lay down this charming volume without expressing a hope that these letters from Italy will only prove the first instalment of a series, describing the different countries and places abroad where Irish saints and teachers of olden time have founded monasteries and schools in the dark ages.

Devia Cypria; notes of an Archeological Journey in Cyprus in 1888. By D. G. Hogarth, Fellow of Magdalen College, late Craven Fellow in the University of Oxford. (London: Henry Frowde, 1889.)

THE island of Cyprus has many claims on English interest. It is practically an English possession, and the circumstances of its acquisition were somewhat dramatic, and are well within the recollection

ment And posse arrar there the v firstwhic the I Fello of th Papl pend plora been jour work alwa natio com

1892

of ev

with It is both mati as w are main of Hog which trave grap land outl furth make

is of

valu

arch

rank

but :

prec

land

lold

nais-

here,

ne is

that

'the

are

bbey

n, as

the

oy of

nato

after

e to

n the

er of

small

f the

875,

otion

rch.'

p of

o, of

rious

1 the

Holy

never

ing a

ment

road

onas-

888.

aven

of everyone. It is the only spot in the world under English government where we are brought into direct contact with the Greek Church. And it is the only spot in that portion of the world which was formerly possessed by Greek civilisation, in which we are free to make our own arrangements as to the archæological discoveries which may be made there. It is in this last aspect that Cyprus makes its appearance in the volume now before us. This volume also represents part of the first-fruits of the recently instituted Craven Travelling Fellowships, which are intended for the encouragement of archæology, and for the production of trained archæologists. Mr. Hogarth was the first Fellow so elected, and his principal occupation during his tenure of the Fellowship was the excavation of Papho, in Cyprus, the old Paphos, the seat of the worship of Paphian Aphrodite. As an appendage to this work, Mr. Hogarth undertook an archæological exploration of certain districts of the island which had never previously been examined from the same point of view. The results of this

journey are contained in Devia Cypria.

Mr. Hogarth's volume consequently falls into the number of those works of archæological exploration, in which English scholars have always been honourably conspicuous, requiring as they do a combination of scholarship and the exploring faculty, which eminently commends itself to the English temperament. It does not, of course, rank with the works of Leake and Hamilton, Fellows and Newton; but it is a creditable member of the same class. A reader, to appreciate it, must be something of a scholar, and have some sympathy with the love of discovery, but it is not necessary to be a specialist. It is written in a plain and pleasant style, and it combines observation both of scenery and of manners with the purely archæological information which is its primary object. Christian remains are described, as well as Greek; and not the least interesting passages in the book are those in which accounts are given of the ancient churches remaining in the island, though the finest of them all, the monastery of Bella Pais, unfortunately did not come within the range of Mr. Hogarth's out-of-the-way rambles. Details are given as to the sites which promise most to the explorer, and of such relics as fell in the traveller's way. Several illustrations are added, taken from photographs; and there is also a clear map of the Carpass, the tongue of land projecting towards the east, which is so marked a feature in the outline of the island. The exploration of Cyprus has been carried further since Mr. Hogarth's travels, and although nothing 'epochmaking' has been discovered, much has been brought to light which is of importance to archæologists, and the possible sites are still far from being exhausted. Hence Mr. Hogarth's book still remains of value, and it will interest all who care for the fascinating subject of archæological exploration.

wde, It is

It is equi-

Letters on Lay Baptism. By Daniel Waterland, D.D. Reprinted from his 'Works.' With Notes by F. Nutcombe Oxenham, M.A., and a Preface by the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles. (London: Masters, 1892.)

WE must candidly say that we regret the appearance of this reprint. There are, at the present time, a sufficient number of questions dividing professing Christians, and it seems to us undesirable to add to them except under the stress of very exceptional circumstances. On this point our opinion differs from that of the editors of the work before us; but however this may be we must bear witness to the very kindly spirit in which the good Bishop of Argyll prefaces the subject. He evidently feels pressed in conscience to bring it prominently before the Church, and we gladly express our admiration for the manner in which he has fulfilled his part. We regret we cannot say that a similar amount of praise is equally deserved by the author of the notes scattered through the volume, for these are chiefly occupied with combating what Mr. Kelsall says, and in no way tend to illustrate what is set forth in his letter. The question, as stated by the Bishop in the preface, seems to us to differ a good deal from Waterland's view. The Bishop claims that there is sufficient doubt about the validity of lay baptism to justify 'the employment of the conditional formula, as that does not commit us to the dogmatic assertion that lay baptism is certainly invalid. If we affirmed this dogmatically we should of course be bound to baptize all converts to the Church unconditionally' (p. xvii). Dr. Waterland demands more than this. He says-

'Baptism implies a covenant between God and man; its essence is their mutual contract in such manner and form as is appointed. The addiministrator acts for God and in God's name, which none can do without commission from Him. Such commission, therefore, is *essential*, and without it the whole is void, as much as if I should pretend to act in the Queen's name without order or warrant, and levy soldiers, naturalize strangers, or anything of like nature. All would be null and void, and the maxim of *quod fieri*, &c., would here be false and impertinent' (p. 5).

Whilst saying, 'I scruple not to own, that within a while it became a rule in most Churches, that such heretical or schismatical baptisms should stand good, provided they were administered in the name of the Trinity,' he contends that such a view of them arose from their 'being administered by men of a sacerdotal character, and on that account were reputed valid. It was thought that neither schism nor heresy nor any censures of the Church could deprive them of the indelible character' (pp. 7, 8). 'The question is "whether those that come to us from our Dissenters, having been pretendedly baptized by men that never had episcopal orders, ought to be baptized by us or no"' (p. 107)? This question, which looks at the subject from the practical side, he answers in the negative. The volume contains two letters from Dr. Waterland, and one from the Rev. C. Kelsall, which is a reply to the first letter of Dr. Waterland and is answered at considerable length by his second. To discuss the question of lay baptism would require a treatise rather than a 'Short Notice,' and that

ott is no cussed Octob interesidera in con his ch book disow may be

1892

THE SOFT OF YOUR AND ADDRESS AND ADDRESS AND ADDRESS AND ADDRESS ADDRE

were

mean

for th

Speech

answe to son is fou the I first the c the a secon 1890. years. of the my ha In 18 was v he w Durir a Dec tries ' sion' comp subje letter

Com

'Chu

Anim

inted

HAM,

SLES.

orint.

tions add

nces.

work

very

efore

er in

at a

otes

with

trate

shop

riew.

ty of

a, as

tism

d of

ılly'

e is

ad-

hout

and

the

alize

the

ame

sms

e of

heir

that

nor

the

hat

zed

om

iins

all,

red lay hat it is not necessary for us to undertake, as the subject was fully discussed in a previous number of this Review ('Lay Baptism,' No. 25, October 1887), to which we would refer such of our readers as are interested in the question. But the subject having attracted a considerable amount of attention in the diocese of Argyll and the Isles in consequence of its having been carefully examined by the Bishop in his charge last year, we can recommend this republication of a learned book to those who may wish to know what can be said in favour of disowning lay baptism, and of reading some of the arguments which may be urged in opposition to that view.

Speeches and Addresses. By the late W. C. Magee, D.D., Lord Archbishop of York, &c. Edited by Charles S. Magee, Barrister-at-Law. (London: Isbister and Co., 1892.)

The rapid sale of the three volumes of sermons by the late Archbishop of York—we had almost written Bishop of Peterborough, and indeed, it was the Bishop of Peterborough who preached most of these sermons and delivered most of the addresses now before us—has encouraged his son to collect and edit a volume of *Speeches and Addresses* 

delivered on special occasions.

A large proportion of these speeches were delivered in the House of Lords and were happily preserved in the pages of *Hansard*. They were 'with few exceptions, extempore in the strictest and most literal meaning of the term, delivered, that is to say, without premeditation, for the Archbishop seldom spoke in the House of Lords except in answer to some direct appeal to himself or to his order, or in reply to some attack upon the Church.' A notable exception to this rule is found in the great oration on the 'Irish Church Bill,' delivered in the House of Lords on June 15, 1869, and fitly chosen for the first place in the present volume, and another is furnished by the carefully prepared array of facts which the speaker welded into the arguments of irresistible force with which he introduced the second reading of the 'Children's Life Insurance Bill' on June 16, These dates cover a period of one-and-twenty fully completed years. In 1869 the Bishop addresses their lordships 'with feelings of the very deepest anxiety and with unfeigned diffidence, owing to my having become so recently a member of your lordships' House.' In 1890 he is addressing the House for almost the last time, for 'it was while attending a committee on Children's Life Insurance that he was seized with the attack of influenza from which he died.' During that period we have speeches in the House on 'Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister' (1870), 'Ecclesiastical Courts and Registries' (1872), 'Ecclesiastical Courts: Motion for a Royal Commission' (1881), 'The Temperance Question' (1872 and 1876), here completed by being happily grouped with addresses on the same subject at Northampton (1876) and Peterborough (1887), and a letter on a 'Proposed Day of Humiliation,' written to the Executive Committee of the Church of England Temperance Society in 1880, 'Church Patronage' (1874), 'Burial Acts' (1877), 'Cruelty to Animals' (1879), 'Cathedral Statutes' (1883), 'Parish Churches'

(1886). As Archbishop of York Dr. Magee seems to have addressed the House of Lords on one occasion only—March 5, 1891. The subject was the 'Clergy Discipline (Immorality) Bill,' and the speech was expanded in an address delivered before the Convocation of York a month later.

Nor does the volume give us examples of the Archbishop's power of speech only. There is an instructive instance of the still rarer power of silence, which debaters in Parliament, in Convocation, and elsewhere, would do well to contemplate. The editor tells us that 'while these speeches were delivered without preparation and without premeditation, on one occasion a carefully prepared speech was never delivered. It was on a bill relating to Ireland upon which he had been urged to speak by Lord Plunket. The bill was favourably received in the House of Lords, and, seeing that that was so, he refrained from speaking on the ground that "a fighting speech" would certainly produce opposition, if not there, yet in the House of Commons.'

How many a cause has been damaged by some advocate who has had a 'fighting speech' burning within him, and has been kindled by it during a debate, which he has not heeded, until he has delivered it to the great injury of the object he had in view!

In addition to the addresses which have been named above, the volume contains one on 'The Danger of Disestablishment' (1885), one on 'National Education Union' (1870), two 'Addresses to Working Men' (1880 and 1891), and three on 'Nonconformity' (1870, 1880, and 1891). The editor would have gladly included many others, but was 'unable to do so owing to the imperfect nature of the reports.' We confess that we should like to have seen some old friends in this permanent form, e.g. the address on 'Agnosticism' delivered at the Manchester Church Congress, which was fully reported; and the carefully prepared 'fighting' speech which was withheld from the House of Lords might, perhaps, have been given to us now.

But the addresses which are given to us, as their mere enumeration shows, deal with many of the chief questions of ecclesiastical and social polity which have become prominent during the present generation, and if we think that the speaker should sometimes have

¹ The editor seems to have fallen into a state of confusion with regard to these dates, which it is difficult to understand when we remember that he is the son of the Archbishop. The last speech in the book is headed Children's Life Insurance Bill, House of Lords, June 16, 1890' (p. 285), and this corresponds with the Contents, p. xi, but this same p. xi of the Contents includes the 'Clergy Discipline (Immorality) Bill, House of Lords, March 5, 1891,' which occurs in pp. 219–26 of the volume. But the editor's preface tells us that 'whereas the volume opens with the first speech delivered in the House of Lords as Bishop of Peterborough, it closes with the last speech delivered there as Archbishop of York,' and connects this with the illness while attending a committee on Children's Life Insurance. As a matter of fact Dr. Magee delivered his speech on 'Children's Life Insurance' on June 16, 1890, when he was still Bishop of Peterborough. Dr. Thomson continued to be Archbishop of York until his death on the morning of Christmas Day, 1890.

taker imbu fully ship, as w

1892

shou adds
Hap
com
Arcl
has
the
spea
trea
bers
in o
follo

and

are are : to b pulp by g he r his (pp. dep thou tend whi the cha vou you wha

bec bee Chr is r onl of in

as t

bas

hur

Spi

ssed The

eech

n of

ower.

arer

and

that

hout

ever

d in

rom

luce

had

y it

the

85),

to

ity '

ded

ure

me

re-

ith-

us era-

ical

ent

ave

ard

ded

35), the

of

But

, it

and

en's

on

oof

ntil

taken a stronger ecclesiastical line, and have shown himself more imbued with the spirit of patristic and historical theology, we thankfully acknowledge the great debt which we all owe to his churchmanship, to his sound practical sense, and to his statesmanlike foresight, as well as to his burning eloquence.

As an example of a position in which we think an Archbishop should have taken a stronger line, reference may be made to the address to the York Convocation on the Clergy Discipline Bill. Happily that Bill was lost, and another containing a clause and accompanied by a canon which preserve the very principle which the Archbishop endeavoured in vain to induce his presbyters to abandon, has become law to the great relief of churchmen. As examples of the statesmanship and powerful common sense of the eloquent speaker, we commend the Archbishop's liberal and yet not unworthy treatment of Nonconformity to the special consideration of the members of the Grindelwald Conference and their friends at home, and in order to induce them to study these pages we offer as baits the following extracts:—

'Much has been said of late respecting the conciliation of Dissenters, and I have heard of strange devices for effecting this object. They are to be allowed to have the free use of the churchyard for burials, but are not to contribute to the cost of maintaining them; they are also to be consulted as to the colour of the dress worn by the clergy in the pulpit; and now, it appears, the noble earl would further conciliate them by giving them a share in the privilege of cheap prosecutions—just as he might conciliate some poor relation, or a squire who had a vote in his county, by giving him a day or two's shooting in his preserves' (pp. 101, 102).

(pp. 101, 102).

'And now as to union with Dissenters. I can hardly utter the depth of my own longing for a reunion between the Church and the orthodox Dissenters of this country. I can hardly utter my sense of the tenderness with which we should speak of those schisms and separations which, God knows, have been brought about so largely in past years by the sinful neglect of those to whom the souls of the people were given in charge. But when you talk of uniting with Dissenters, you must endeavour to put yourselves as far as possible in the place of those to whom you offer this unity, and ascertain what is their idea of unity—this is just what the preceding speakers have not done—because, unless you agree as to the definition of the thing you propose, you have really no tangible basis to start from.

'Now as to what the idea of Nonconformists about unity was, some hundred years ago, there can be little doubt. It was the unity of the Spirit, as manifested in outward unity of communion. And to such bodies there would have been very little difficulty in proposing a reunion; because all that would have been needed to bring it about would then have been the removal, as they would have put it, of those practices of our Church which seemed to them to hinder this outward unity.

'But is this the modern Dissenting idea of unity? I venture to say it is not. It seems to me that the modern idea of unity is that it is not only unnecessary, but that it is hardly even desirable, that the inner unity of the Spirit in individuals should be manifested by any outward union in one visible community, joined together by a common discipleship, and in the breaking of bread . . . .

'Unless, therefore, it is distinctly recognised by us that the idea of unity, as existing in the minds of our Dissenting brethren, is essentially different from ours, it would, I believe, be a mistake for us to offer them unity. If we attempt to make concessions, while ignoring this fact, then we shall have been making these concessions, and their attendant alteration in our Church laws and practices, upon a false principle, and I believe they will come to no good result in the end. My own opinion is, that we should endeavour to effect our own Church reforms, not so much upon the principle of turning to the right hand or the left, in order to win over this or that Dissenting community—remembering this, that concessions on the one hand may imply loss on the other; but that we should, whether Dissenters or Churchmen, turn more reverently, more searchingly, and more honestly, back to primitive antiquity-in which I include, as above all, Scriptural antiquity; that we should, every one of us, draw nearer and nearer to what we believe to be the Scriptural model of the Christian Church, so far as we can find it in the Bible; that we should endeavour, where Scripture has left us free choice, to adapt the laws and constitution of our Church to the exigencies of our own time and the circumstances of our own people; and having done this, exercising all loving charity, forbearance, and truthful honesty of speech-for truthful honesty is a part of real love-towards our brethren of the Dissenting bodies, wait and pray until God, in His good time, may give to us the blessings of reunion and of peace' (pp. 272-5).

We had intended to add some quotations giving the Archbishop's real views and expressions on the 'Temperance Question' which differ widely from those which have been not unfrequently attributed to him, but we have exceeded the limits of a 'Short Notice.' In taking leave of this work we heartily commend it as an almost necessary addition to the library of every student of the ecclesiastical and moral questions of our own day.

We must accompany our commendation with a note of warning to the young orator who would tread in the Archbishop's steps. Let not the reference to extempore speaking in the literal sense of the term mislead him. No one knew better than Dr. Magee what most careful preparation meant whenever it was possible. With all his splendid gifts he recognized that 'orator fit non nascitur.' It was publicly stated after he was Archbishop, that he had written several times a short and simple answer to an address of welcome, to which a less-gifted man would have replied in the first words which occurred. He was more richly gifted—with the power of taking pains.

Faithful unto Death. An Account of the Sufferings of the English Franciscans during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, from Contemporary Records. By J. M. STONE. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co., 1892.)

THE author has not produced much that is new in this volume, and we have had a good many accounts in recent years of the Elizabethan martyrs. He has, however, presented us with a readable and interesting book. The appendix is entirely new, and gives a short history of the Franciscan convent at Taunton, which still exists, having been founded by Father Gennings in 1621.

the ce a Sar Deus, Thirt of the of the some unior the i envo much not t could state Engl Rom us so it w they place

1892

IT is notirecip reviewed tion a provery been most are well from continuous are well from continu

Sern

for into title the one out term

a of

ially

hem

then

era-

ieve

we

pon

ver

ons uld,

ch-

in-

us.

of

we

ws

the

ful

ng

he

p's

ch

ed

In

st

al

ıg

S.

of

at

It

n

o

g

One of the most remarkable members of this community was the celebrated Christopher Davenport, otherwise known as Francis a Sancta Clara, who is known principally by his treatise entitled Deus, Natura, Gratia, which contains an appendix interpreting the Thirty-nine Articles as far as possible in harmony with the decrees of the Council of Trent. This work was much talked of at the time of the publication of No. 90 of the Tracts for the Times, and created some sensation when there was some idea of Charles I. meditating a union between the Churches of Rome and England. Chimerical as the idea was, it was certainly entertained by Gregorio Panzani, the envoy from Urban VIII. to the court of Charles. Davenport was much in favour with the King and with Laud, who undoubtedly did not think there was any such chance as Panzani dreamed of. We could wish the author had not committed himself to the foolish statement that Laud 'was much more bent on being Pope himself in England than on making any serious advance towards the Pope of Rome' (p. 119.) We should also have been glad if he had given us some reference for the assertion that in the prospect of such union 'it was thought that many clergymen hesitated to marry, in order that they might keep their livings' in case of such reconciliation taking place.

Sermons in Miniature for Extempore Preachers: Sketches for every Sunday and Holy Day of the Christian Year. By the Rev. A. G. Mortimer, D.D., Rector of St. Mary's, Castleton, N.Y., Author of Helps to Meditation. (London: Masters, 1891.)

It is recorded of a certain Frenchman that, when asked to write a notice of a cookery book, he conscientiously tasted every one of its recipes before he sent in his paper. Upon the same standard the reviewer should have himself preached every one of these miniature sermons before he committed himself to an unreserved commendation of them. Without pretending to have gone through so exhaustive a process we may yet claim to have tested Dr. Mortimer's discourses very thoroughly, and we can very cordially commend them. It has been sarcastically, yet truly, said that skeleton sermons are for the most part very dry bones indeed; but these are not skeletons. They are what they profess to be, sermons in miniature, and it would be well for many congregations if they obtained as their weekly pabulum from the pulpit as much sound teaching and careful thought as are condensed into Dr. Mortimer's brief pages.

The method by which so satisfactory a result has been reached may be briefly described. First a text is selected from the Gospel for the day (with but few exceptions), so that the sermon fits suitably into the Church's order of teaching. Secondly, a clear, suggestive title, which indicates the special subject to be handled, is placed at the head of each miniature, and thus thought is concentrated on one definite theme. Thirdly, under the several points which arise out of such a heading the chief lines of thought are indicated in terse and pregnant sentences, whilst an occasional quotation gives piquancy to the truth which is being insisted on. To say that these

tl

ir

a

eighty-four miniatures vary in interest and power is only to say that their author is a man of like passions with other preachers; but the average of excellence is high and well-sustained.

It is one of the chief values of such a help to preachers as these miniature sermons are designed to be that they suggest fresh ideas to minds which may be not merely wearied with the anxieties inseparable from pastoral labour, but also much exhausted by repeated treatment of the same subjects as year after year goes by. Dr. Mortimer's sketches are for the most part signally fresh without being forced in their application. Sometimes a familiar subject supplies him with the opportunity for setting forth truth in striking terms, as when the healing of the centurion's servant suggests 'self-discipline as the predisposing cause of faith,' and the raising of the widow's son at Nain leads him to treat of 'the coincidences of life.' instance may serve at once as an example of Dr. Mortimer's fulness and his fertility of thought. Our Lord's lament over Jerusalem affords the text for a sermon on the ignorance of the soul. The city in all its beauty is a type of the human soul, fair but ignorant— Point I.—(i.) of its true future, (ii.) of its true happiness, (iii.) of its true friend. Point II. Jerusalem, like the soul, was ignorant of its opportunities (i.) of repenting; it was its last chance of walking in the via purgativa; (ii.) of learning; never again could they tread the via illuminativa; (iii.) of grace, to be found only in the via unitiva. Point III. The city, like the human soul, was ignorant of the dangers that threatened it: (i.) the enemy at the gates, (ii.) its own helplessness, (iii.) the eternity of its loss. Even as condensed within these half-dozen lines here is a full sermon in miniature. We hope cordially that the reception given to the present volume will lead Dr. Mortimer to issue (as he proposes) another on more general subjects.

The Prayer of Humanity: Sermons on the Lord's Prayer. By H. N. Grimley, M.A., Rector of Norton, Suffolk, &c., Author of Tremadoc Sermons, &c. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co., 1892.)

This volume of sermons on the Lord's Prayer is instinct with all the tenderness of feeling, the subtlety of insight, and the spirit of fervent and mystic piety which have marked Mr. Grimley's earlier works. It might be anticipated that a series of discourses so diverse in origin that, whilst some have been delivered to city and some to country congregations, others are as yet unspoken, would present considerable inequality, and would lack a unity both of style and purpose. Unity of purpose is, however, secured by the author's constant and conscious pursuance of his aim, which is 'to show (1) how the two great truths, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood and Sisterhood of Humanity, are enshrined for us in the Lord's Prayer (p. vii); and (2) 'how our acknowledgment of God as our Father should lead us to an increasing recognition of one another as brothers and sisters' (p. ix). Unity of style is obtained by addressing to the villagers of Norton thoughts so closely packed as well as so deep as to be (in

ct.

nat

he

ese

eas

n-

ed

or-

ng

as

ne

on

er

SS

m

he

its

its

in

ne

a.

n-

in

)e

ıd

al

V.

e

lt.

n

d

t

d

d

S

f

1 ..

our judgment) often beyond their grasp. Yet Mr. Grimley's book will not be less welcome to our readers because it is better suited to the study than to the pulpit, whilst even for the latter its repeated insistence upon the preacher's central theme may make it more instructive to rustic hearers than we should at first be disposed to allow.

For it is one special and constant element in Mr. Grimley's sermons that he never speaks of spiritual advancement, nor dwells upon the inner discernment of the spiritual life without insistence upon the outward results which invariably accompany it. In the somewhat stilted phraseology into which the author occasionally falls he says—

'The result of inward enrichment is that the words and deeds of those so enriched help to put a beneficent impress upon the world around them. That beneficent impress enables it to be said that the Kingdom of God has not only been inwardly discerned by us, but has also been by us outwardly established. The kingdom of heaven within us has become for others a kingdom of heaven without us. The new heaven inwardly discerned has fashioned around us a new earth for the comfort and welfare of others '(p. 71.)

Such teaching is both true and essentially necessary in a day when practical Antinomianism is largely prevalent, and when religion is too often sublimated into mere imaginary feeling; but it lacks the simplicity of Scriptural directness. 'Little children, let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous' (1 John iii. 7).

Indeed, the one signal blot on this otherwise most attractive volume is the occasional introduction of phrases and expressions which suggest a straining after originality. We might pass over such brief sentences as 'Prayer is an ethereal tremor, which is transmitted through the whole realm of souls' (p. 4), or 'As long as we know only in part the harmony of our mental nature cannot be complete' (p. 80); but what can be more forced and unnatural than the long-drawn simile and its application, with which so familiar a truth as that every good and perfect gift cometh down to us from the Father of lights is elaborated in the following passage?

'The beneficent vibrations which proceed from the sun and traverse the vast space in which earth and planets revolve, not only divide themselves into the vibrations which bestow on us light and heat, but also can be shown to consist of the union of all the series of vibrations which give us the varying rainbow colours which beautify the world of nature and gladden the eyes of dwellers on this earth. So, too, the divine idea of the Fatherhood of God embraces not only the thought of the Lord as the Light of the World—as one who in a divine, fatherly way guides us into all truth—and the thought of God as Lord of Love—who in a divine, motherly way nourishes us with all goodness; but also it can be seen to spread itself out fanwise and present to our enlightened vision in varied hues the prismatic band of excellences, all of which have their source and origin in the Divine Nature, and thence are radiated forth to become incarnate in human lives' (p. 17).

We should not, however, do Mr. Grimley justice if we led the reader to suppose that sentences of such portentous length and clumsy construction formed the staple of the Prayer of Humanity. Amongst many beautiful subjects, beautifully handled, such as the hour of prayer, the kingdom of truth and love, the upward discipline of temptation, the nature of divine forgiveness and of our mutue forgiveness of one another, we have only space for a single quotation, which strikingly sets forth an aspect of absolution which is frequently overlooked:—

'As the Church's voice is one of love, is the utterance of the tenderest love which incarnates itself in human lives, and, as the word of forgiveness is a word of love, how can the Church do other than take the word of forgiveness on her lips? Words of divine forgiveness will ever sound in the depths of a penitent soul with the utmost acceptance, not when they are seen noted down on the pages of a book, but when they are uttered in the accents of tenderness and sympathy by a human voice. The assurance of divine forgiveness can be, and often is, conveyed to a penitent soul in the whisper of the Holy Spirit. . . . But the hour of penitence is often an hour of human weakness. It is often an hour when the soul craves that consolation shall be brought to it, expressed in the tones of a human voice. Divine forgiveness, divine consolation, are not the less divine when taking form in human words, spoken in an accent of sympathy by the lips of a brother. The Church responds to this craving. She is divinely commissioned so to do. She has to do so with compassionate tenderness. . . . The Church's ministers speak on behalf of the Church's Lord the word of pardon' (pp. 145-7).

## Accounts of the Obedientiars of Abingdon Abbey. Edited by R. E. G. Kirk. (Printed for the Camden Society, MDCCCXCII.)

PROBABLY few will be interested enough to read many pages of these accounts of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Mary of Abingdon. They are an exact copy in the original Latin, with all its contractions from the rolls preserved in the collection of Sir Harry Verney, into whose possession the site of the abbey has come. Some have been printed at length, some only in abstract. But the Introduction, which extends to sixty pages, contains much that is useful and interesting. And first we have here an explanation of the titles borne by the principal officers, specimens of whose accounts are given from the year 1322 to 1479. They are called *obedientiarii*, as being under subjection to the rule. And this word has been adopted by the editor in preference to the form *monastic officer*, which scarcely adequately represents the Latin word. Under this name are included the treasurer of the convent, who had to deal with large sums of money, for at the time of the suppression the revenue of the abbey was estimated at more than 1,876l. yearly. Other subordinate officers were the precentor, the sacristan, the cellarer, the almoner, together with others, one of whom Mr. Kirk has called by the awkward name of lignar. This officer comes next in importance to the kitchener and the chamberlain. The Latin form of the name is lignarius, but the editor has coined the English rendering of it as lignar, objecting to the terms woodreeve and woodward and woodne

d

y.

ie

ie

al

1-

is

st

d

n

t

s

S

1

2

man as not adequately representing his occupation, which was to provide fuel by purchase and not by cutting down trees. It is noticeable that the accounts of the infirmarer are very brief, from which it may be inferred that the monks enjoyed good health in spite of occasional periods of general sickness. The drugs used would puzzle ordinary readers, if it were not for the excellent glossary which explains all the words which are obsolete or uncommon. Amongst them we quote as specimens diagridium, which represents scammony; garofilum, cloves; penidræ, a medicine for the lungs; rapigna galieni, bitter aloes; sistleos, fleabane, &c.

The items of these accounts afford some curious information—as, for instance, we learn the enormous size of the Easter wax taper from the following: 'Remanent de cera in cereo Paschali CCC li.' Other particulars of interest as regards the life within the convent may be gathered from various parts of the volume, but nearly all have been summarized by the editor in his excellent introduction, the specialities of the accounts having little of interest for ordinary readers. In common cases of illness there was probably one monk, the infirmarer, who was able to prescribe and administer medicines, the physicians or surgeons mentioned apparently residing at some distance, probably at Oxford.

The editor has given us a graphic description, a little enlarged from the picture as displayed in the one incomplete account of the common chest, which has survived. It describes the abbot in the process of the collection of his tithes,—

'with some of his monks and servants and the contingent of Oxonian undergraduates, accompanied by the harvest waggon of the abbey, on the one side and the refractory villagers, armed with their implements of husbandry, on the other. There has apparently been no opposition to the entrance of the monastic forces at the gates of the common fields, but while the abbot, under the protection of his escort, proceeds through the furlongs and acres, pointing out every tenth sheaf to his servants, who seize and transfer it to the waggon, the villagers are resisting the proceedings as far as they are able at every step, which leads to frequent encounters between the more violent of either party' (p. xliii).

If Abingdon was a specimen of a Benedictine abbey, it seems from these accounts that every officer was independent and not subordinate to any other, that a separate building was assigned to him, together with a portion of the estates of the abbey, and that he was bound to defray the charges which had been imposed on the office as well as to contribute his due proportion of tenths and subsidies. Each officer, at least in later times, seems to have had a clerk, who drew up the accounts in duplicate, giving one copy to the officer at the audit and retaining the other in his own hands.

We have no means of testing the accuracy of Mr. Kirk's transcript. We should have fancied the word *curtarius* had been a mistake for *curiarius* if he had not himself drawn attention to the singular mode of spelling the word adopted in this document.

189

are

Ca du Eo

fo

W

(a

P

The Co-operative Movement To-day. By George Jacob Holyoake, 'Social Questions of To-day' Series, (London: Methuen and Co., 1801.)

In reading this book we have found it more valuable for a certain vigorous and stimulating character than for direct instructiveness. It is too deficient in method to serve satisfactorily the purpose indicated in its title, namely, that of stating the precise position of the co-operative movement at the present day, and of estimating its prospects for the future. This is the more unfortunate, because there is an impression abroad that co-operation is failing to answer the expectations formed by those who have preached and propagated Most persons who have taken an interest in the subject could name, from their own experience, more than one co-operative store which has broken down, or which drags on a precarious and inefficient existence, and, what is more important, it is to be feared that co-operative production is, in London at least, a discouraging failure. We should have been glad if Mr. Holyoake had faced this latter problem in particular, and had explained, as he is quite capable of doing, the causes which have retarded progress in this direction. These causes are, we believe, twofold. The first and worst is the want of mutual confidence and esprit de corps which unhappily distinguishes the working classes. It is an evil which will be cured in Clubs and trades unions are doing something to make working-men personally acquainted with one another, and acquaintance will lead to confidence; but meanwhile it is almost impossible to make them pull heartily together, sacrificing something for the common good in times of trouble, and looking a little beyond the apparent interests of the moment. The second cause of failure is It is the difficulty of finding managers who will work with as much energy for a society as for themselves. Industrial concerns cannot be managed by a committee any more than a battle can be fought by a council of war, and it is rare indeed to find a manager who both deserves and receives the full confidence of the members of the society, and at the same time works with the energy and resource of the successful private trader.

The future of co-operation depends on the success with which these difficulties are met; and consequently one would have wished to see a fuller discussion of them in this book, which, if it is not read by working men co-operators themselves, should and will be read by very many who are in contact with the working classes, and can hand on its ideas to them. Of the general principles of co-operation, however, its early history, and the benefits which its adoption brings to the labourer, Mr. Holyoake gives an excellent and most interesting account; and no one is better fitted for the task than this veteran apostle of co-operation. But, in addition, it is difficult to read his book without being led to reflect seriously on the general question of the remuneration of labour. This is the subject which, before all others, will have to be faced by the present generation; and it is subject upon which it is most essential that Churchmen should make up their minds. The problem is briefly this. The labouring classes

KE.

ain

ess.

dihe

its

ise

er

ed ld

re

fi-

at

e.

er

of

n.

e

3-

n

e

are rising in the social scale. They are becoming articulate, in Carlyle's phrase, and they ask that a larger share of the joint produce of capital and labour should be given to the latter. Political Economy tells us that every person is entitled to what wages he can get in the labour market, and no more. The labourer is free to ask for whatever he likes, but the employer is equally free to get his work done at the lowest wages for which he can get labourers. But (and here is the question which the future has to solve) is the law of Political Economy the last word on the subject? Its laws are irrefutable, it is true, but they rest, and avowedly rest, on the axiom that the prime motive of all conduct is the desire for wealth. Now this axiom has only been true of modern society for about a century and a half, and there is no necessity that it should last for ever. Two or three centuries ago the action of people in general was very little directed by reference to economic laws. Other principles were held of more importance. There are indications that it will be so again, and that the industrial epoch in which we live is transitory. Political Economy may become moralized, and people may see, and act upon their seeing, that the intercourse of man with man should not consist of attempts to obtain the uttermost farthing from one another. It is of the greatest importance that the Church should be ready to speak clearly on this matter, and to speak justly. If it deliberately decides that it is fair that labour should have a larger share in the joint product of labour and capital, then, without sanctioning the grossly exaggerated language used by the advocates of labour, and without speaking harshly of capitalists, who are perfectly within their rights, it must yet emphatically preach the duty of allowing a greater proportion of profits to be distributed among those who help to produce them. Whether the full solution of the difficulty is to be found in co-operation, as Mr. Holyoake believes, need not be discussed now; but it does seem probable that some system of proportional profit-sharing is the only effectual method. The main point is that the question should be met in a fair and open manner, and that Churchmen should not, in order to save the trouble of thinking for themselves, fall back upon the maxims of bare Political Economy.

Mr. Holyoake strives to be fair to employers as well as to employed, and deprecates the use of hard words; but there are a few passages (notably one at the top of p. 144) which should be expunged in a second edition. Moreover, it is not true that 'there would be no poor were justice done to industry' (p. 140). There is plenty of honest poverty, no doubt; but there is, and always must be until human nature is very greatly changed, a very large amount of poverty which is due to vice and idleness. Mr. Holyoake's literary flowers are not always satisfactory. He misquotes Gray, and ascribes the lines to Collins (p. 41); and Bacon's ideal state was not

called the 'New Atlanta' (pp. 4, 5).

189

het

IT

th

de

br

bo

m

m

ir

a

b

For God and Humanity: a Romance of Mount Carmel. By HASKETT SMITH, M.A. Three Volumes. (Edinburgh and London: Blackwood and Sons, 1891.)

THE interest of this novel lies not so much in its own merits as a story, as in the fact that the principal character in it, Cyril Gordon, is obviously and avowedly drawn from one of the most curious and striking personalities of our days, Laurence Oliphant. Everyone has recently been reading Mrs. Oliphant's biography of her brilliant relative, and everyone must have been fascinated by the problems which that biography did so much to raise and so little to solve. The sudden act of self-surrender to the mysterious prophet Harris (himself a sufficiently enigmatic character) is intelligible, if strange; but the long continuance of that surrender, the final emancipation and the life of the latter days at Haifa, these present riddles which could only be answered by one who was in close intercourse and sympathy with Laurence Oliphant, which Mrs. Oliphant plainly was not. Mr. Haskett Smith knew him only during the last years of his life, but he was one of those who found in Oliphant's religious views a satisfaction which they could get nowhere else, and who enrolled themselves as his disciples, and were in close association with him at On the earlier part of Oliphant's career Mr. Haskett Smith does not attempt to throw any light, nor are the incidents narrated of Cyril Gordon (one can recognize the reason which suggested this choice of name) in the story founded on the actual details of Oliphant's life in Palestine, but the opinions and character claim to be faithfully copied from him. Read in this light the romance acquires a distinct interest. Regarded merely as a novel, it does not take a high rank. The incidents, though often striking, are not convincing, and the dialogues are stilted and unnatural, while too many of the characters approach an almost impossible standard of perfection. But the descriptions of the Eastern scenery and of the customs and habits of the Druses are genuine and sympathetic, and the religious opinions put forward are earnest and striking. There is nothing in them to offend anyone. The author's view as to the central doctrine of the Christian creed, the Divinity of Christ, is nowhere explicitly stated; but nothing is stated which is inconsistent with the truest Christianity. On the contrary, the morality ascribed to Cyril Gordon (and, no doubt, true of the author of 'Piccadilly') consists of an earnest attempt to live to its fullest extent the life of sacrifice of which Christ set the example, repudiating utterly the usual compromises of the conventional Christian. There is the greatest possible truth in Gordon's denunciation of Self and Compromise as the two enemies of real Christian progress, and against Self Oliphant waged an uncompromising war. On this subject there is much that is stimulating in Mr. Haskett Smith's pages for which we should wish to tender our thanks to him. Of the more mystical part of Laurence Oliphant's creed little is shown, except a firm belief in the reality of the spiritual influence of soul on soul, whether between two persons still alive, or between the living and the dead. On this one would wish to say little; those who feel such an influence are often morally stronger and

ETT

on:

as a

on,

and

has

ant

ms

he

m-

nd

ch

nd

as

is

rs

d

h

S

better for it, and those who do not are not qualified to speak with authority upon the subject.

Montrose. By Moweray Morris. 'English Men of Action' Series. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1892.)

It may sound sacrilege to some enthusiastic persons to say it, but, if the truth must be told, it may well be doubted whether Montrose deserves a place in a series such as this. He is the hero of one brief and brilliant episode, which unquestionably does deserve to be both told and retold; but the greater part of his career is only moderately important and moderately interesting. Probably the most picturesque method of treating his biography would be frankly to make surrender to what Macaulay called the lues biographica, and insist on regarding him as necessarily the most important figure in all the leading transactions of the time. Then a monograph might be written on the rebellion against Charles I. from the Scotch point of view, with merely the slight distortion of focus necessary for making Montrose the foremost character in the whole embroilment. It is to Mr. Mowbray Morris's credit that he has resisted this temptation. His historical conscientiousness is too great to allow him to trifle with truth in this way. Montrose was no politician, and although he was always to some extent a leading man, whose ability was recognized, especially by his enemies, yet he had little to do with the evolution of the quarrel between Charles and his northern kingdom. Consequently, since Mr. Morris adheres faithfully to his duty as a biographer, the general course of the Scotch controversy only forms the background; and it is difficult to make it an interesting back-A minute study of it is interesting as an object lesson in human character and the development of popular movements; when not studied for its own sake, it is a sordid and confused picture.

In spite of this difficult material, Mr. Morris has done a very good piece of work. He gives an admirably lucid sketch of Montrose's life, neither exaggerating nor extenuating, and endeavouring successfully to maintain a true sense of historical proportion; and his narrative of Montrose's campaign, the one purple patch in the history of the Royalist cause in Scotland, is so good as to make us wish it were longer. The least details of that brilliant struggle against fate, that apparently successful welding of materials too unstable to achieve a permanent result, are full of value and interest, and heighten our respect for the personality of the one man who could turn these unpromising materials to account. The reader's heart inevitably goes with Montrose and his Macdonalds in their raid upon Argyll and their brilliant victory at Inverlochy; and the romance with which Aytoun has surrounded the end of the Royalist hero is a romance which has an ample foundation in fact. temptation to a biographer to indulge in rhetoric on such a subject is very great; but Mr. Mowbray Morris has resisted it, and his work is worthy of the biographer of another and later Graham, the kindred spirit of Claverhouse.

VOL. XXXV.-NO. LXIX.

180

an

th

wi se

de

of

in

sh

th

ta hi

fo

W

m

m

it

fe

ir

th

S

tl

tl

Classical Poems. By WILLIAM ENTRIKEN BAILY. (Cincinnati, U.S.A.: R. Clarke and Co., 1892.)

It is generally felt to be a fatal commendation of a person to say that he 'means well;' but it is difficult conscientiously to give any other verdict on the poems contained in this volume. Mr. Baily unquestionably means well. He feels the attraction of the classical mythology, and enjoys dwelling upon the ideas which it calls up; but in the severest sense his verses are neither classical nor poems. They are classical in subject but not in style. The author's affinities. as indeed might be gathered from his preface, are with Spenser and Shelley and Keats, rather than with Milton or Landor. This, in itself, is no condemnation; the example of Keats is enough to show that a poet may treat a classical subject in an unclassical manner, and yet write poetry of the first order of excellence. But the more serious defect of Mr. Baily's compositions is their lack of poetry. The technique is imperfect, and consequently the failure of inspiration lands the writer in bald prose. For instance (the writer is addressing Horace) :-

> 'Page after page was turned—to read of eagerness Peculiar to thy youth; how thee imbued With tact thy sire; of thy apparent meagreness Of will when facing Mæcenas; how sued Thy city friends for news; of that bore slow, At last from whom thee rescued Apollo' (p. 30).

The awkward scansion of the proper names is peculiar to this passage; but the grammatical inversions of the second and sixth lines are painfully common throughout the volume. Mr. Baily can write better than this; but similar rough tracts of prose are unfortunately far from unfrequent. The verse is often unmusical, and unusual pronunciations are forced upon one by the metre. For instance, the second syllable of the word 'origins' should not be scanned long (p. 29), and 'trait' should not rhyme with 'weight' (p. 11) or 'await' (p. 16). But if Mr. Baily will study the technical management of the material which he has to handle, language and metre, he may write something which will be gladly welcomed as an advance upon his present volume.

A Primer on Browning. By F. MARY WILSON. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1891.)

THE first thought of anyone who takes pleasure in Browning's poetry, on reading the title of this volume, must inevitably be that all primers and handbooks to Browning are an abomination, and that if any is necessary Mrs. Sutherland Orr's is, from her intimate acquaintance with the poet, the best and most authoritative. It must be admitted, however, that this would do some injustice to Miss Wilson's work, which is well done according to its plan, while its price (half a crown) makes it easily accessible to all who are likely to want it. But it may be allowable to emphasize the fact that any such guide to the study of a poet is to be avoided as much as possible. Admitting the difficulties which beset Browning's poetry, the best way to acquire a real knowledge of its merit is, not to work

steadily through with primer and handbook, beginning with Pauline and Paracelsus and ending with Asolando, but to read the easier and better poems first, and only proceed to the more difficult when the taste for Browning has been acquired and an insight gained into the characteristics of his style. Anyone who wishes to experiment with Browning should be advised to take one of the volumes of selections from his poetry (either the two-volume edition issued in his life-time or the shilling popular edition published since his death), and begin by reading the poems contained therein, which include at once the easiest and the best (apart from certain books of The Ring and the Book) that he ever wrote. There is no harm in having at hand some handbook, Mrs. Orr's for choice, or, if a shorter work is preferred, then Miss Wilson's is perfectly adequate. To these reference may be made when special difficulty is found in the comprehension of a poem, and often a clue may thus be obtained which would have cost the reader much pains to discover for himself; at the same time, a reader who has anything of the taste for Browning will find it far more satisfactory to get at his meaning, where there is any difficulty about it, by repeated reading of the poetry itself, than to have it thrust at him in the necessarily bald and prosaic form which it assumes in a handbook or primer.

It is a curious fact that, even to genuine lovers of Browning, most of the volumes that have been written about him are wholly unattractive, if not actually repulsive. Whether this is due to the manner of writing and speaking about him fostered by the Browning Society, we need not stop to inquire here. Miss Wilson's book is itself not quite free from the taint. Its style is not attractive, and we feel very sure that no one who was ignorant of Browning would feel impelled to the study of him by beginning with this Primer. But as an aid to those who have already some acquaintance with the poet it is, we think, well and carefully executed. The explanations are necessarily short, and consequently somewhat bald; but there are very few of the extraordinary blunders which are apt to disfigure the pages of those who venture to explain the myriad allusions of Browning and unravel his obscurer utterances. Here and there the explanations are either inadequate or wrong. The comments on My Star and ' Which ?' (in Asolando) appear to us to miss the full meaning of the poems, while the ending of *Clive* is wholly misrepresented, the words 'Fearfully courageous' being taken as spoken by Clive himself, whereas they are clearly those of the narrator. Miss Wilson is rather less than just to A Blot in the Scutcheon and Aristophanes' Apology, while she rates the Parleyings higher than we should care to put them. But these are only the natural divergencies of individual opinion, and on the whole Miss Wilson has executed well, as far as her space allowed her, the task which she has undertaken. The introductory chapters on Browning's life and characteristics are painstaking, but they do not take the place of the thoroughly sympathetic yet sane essay on Browning which has yet to be written, and which will lure readers to the study of him, as Macaulay does to Milton, or Matthew Arnold to Wordsworth.

ti,

ay

ny

ly

al

;

S.

S,

d

e

189:

mei

and

pre: Wh

and

Ma

Dr

pro

phi

lon

spa

tio

Ar

po

no

Ca

mi

Po

T

CC

C

Sie

de

B

of

aı

th

Phaon and Sappho, a Play; with a selection of Poems. By J. D. Hosken. (Penzance: F. Rodda, 1891.)

THERE is so much that is creditable in the drama which occupies the greater part of this little volume, that one feels some disappointment that it does not, as a whole, attain complete success. Mr. Hosken would appear to have studied the Elizabethan dramatists very thoroughly; for, without any direct imitation of them, the tone of his play is far more like what we find in Massinger or Ford than what we are accustomed to in the literary drama of to-day. There is no word-painting, no striving after effect; the interest is intended to be found in the situations and in the emotions, which, however strong, are not extravagantly expressed. The corollary of this is that since Mr. Hosken is not, at any rate as yet, the equal in genius of the Elizabethans, he is apt to become rather flat. He has not quite the instinct of genius, which can be effective with moderate expression; and he does not try, as so many writers do, to make up for this by multiplication of words. The plot is good if not very original; the verse is usually smooth, though with a free use (sometimes too free) of dramatic irregularity. Rhymed couplets (not at the ends of scenes) are introduced too often in the earlier scenes. The comma usually placed before a vocative is here regularly omitted, which, besides offending the eye, is liable to lead to momentary misunderstandings in such phrases as 'Where would'st thou fly my love?' But altogether the writing is interesting enough to make us wish to see more of Mr. Hosken's work. It should, perhaps, be stated in conclusion that the Phaon and Sappho here presented to us have no connexion with the somewhat famous persons of those names, beyond the fact that they live in Lesbos. Phaon and Sappho are in love, it is true, but Phaon is not faithless, and Sappho does not leap down the Leucadian cliff; neither is Sappho a poetess, nor does she betray the excesses of passion which characterised her more celebrated namesake. In short, the title is misleading, and any other names would have suited the story equally well.

A Song-Book of the Soul. By MARJORY G. J. KINLOCH, Author of a History of Scotland, chiefly in its Ecclesiastical Aspect. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co., 1892.)

This is a volume of short poems composed by a Roman Catholic lady. That it will prove welcome to many of her co-religionists we cannot doubt. How far the all-important element of religion may in such cases affect other readers, who are non-Roman, it is by no means easy to guess. In the case of a well-known Anglican bard, George Herbert, one of his greatest admirers (Coleridge) has somewhere expressed his belief that Herbert's literary merits, though considerable, will seldom be found capable of attracting a lover of poetry who is not in matters ecclesiastical simpatico. One Roman Catholic of fame, the poet Pope, contrived to put forth volumes of verse, which, for the most part, might seem to be written by a deist, who at moments (though unconsciously) almost strayed into the error of Pantheism. We speak under correction, but we can only re-

e

it

n

f

t o e

e

member a couple of lines of Pope <sup>1</sup> which hint at his religious creed, and even these, by the force of circumstances, have ceased to be impressive. His predecessor, Dryden, had not been thus reticent. Whether Dryden's conversion to the Church of Rome was sincere or not has been ably discussed, in the affirmative by Samuel Johnson and by Walter Scott, in the negative by Lord Macaulay. Even Cardinal Newman incidentally allows something of the force of one of Macaulay's arguments—namely, the unsatisfactory tone of some of Dryden's latest verse. But Dryden, at any rate, unlike Pope, openly proclaimed the side which he wished to espouse; and some of his phrases (for instance, 'the milk-white hind') will endure perhaps as long as controversy lasts. A less questionable kind of convert, who has fairly won a place among English poets, is Richard Crashaw.

It would take up more time and space than we can at present spare to discuss the claims of Roman Catholic poets of the present century. That their hymn-writers have won a place in the collections of other religionists is undeniable. Both Presbyterian and Anglican editors make use of such compositions. It may suffice to point to Hymns Ancient and Modern by way of example.

It is, however, somewhat remarkable that of these hymnodists none were born in the communion of Rome. Newman, Faber, Caswall were all nurtured in the greater freedom of another communion. Indeed we do not know of any eminent Roman Catholic poet born within the three kingdoms during the last 220 years except Moore; for we cannot, as we have already implied, seriously consider Pope to be such as a poet, whatever he may have been as a man. The case remains unaltered, if we take into account the poetesses as well as the poets.

Miss Kinloch is not, we believe, an exception. Of seventy-two compositions included in this volume, a considerable proportion appeal to the vast majority of those 'who profess and call themselves Christians;' though occasionally, even in these, particular expressions may suggest the camp in which she has thrown her lot. We do not suppose that she will be adjudged so high a place as Elizabeth Browning, Adelaide Procter, or Christina Rossetti. But, controversy apart, her volume will, we think, be allowed to contain much that is pathetic, much that is elevating. And there exists throughout a ring of deep sincerity. The humility and devotion seem to us very real; and such poems as 'He may come' (p. 159) and 'Headache' (p. 205), though their titles may provoke a smile in the case of very youthful readers, will, we doubt not, be welcomed with thankfulness by many of her sisters who are no longer in their teens.

Pope was stigmatizing that unjust inscription on the Monument which stated that the great fire of London was the work of Roman Catholics. But in 1829 this charge, by a unanimous vote of the Common Council, was deleted.

We refer to the well-known passage:-

<sup>&#</sup>x27;Where London's column, pointing to the skies, Like a tall bully, lifts its head and lies.'

189

sev

seri

exp

rev

(Lo

ado

Ba

COL

wh

He

no

led

for un

wit

vei

an

me

sp

tai

of

hi

la

la

R

Ti

W

te

ha

of

de

BRIEF NOTES ON NEW BOOKS, REPRINTS, NEW EDITIONS, ETC. READERS of the Church Quarterly Review will not need to be reminded that on two occasions we called their attention to the facsimile of the original manuscript of the Book of Common Prayer (as annexed to the Act of Uniformity of 1662), which was issued early last year.1 The Queen's Printers have now laid us all under fresh obligations by reproducing that facsimile in type—it is believed for the first time (The Book of Common Prayer, from the Original Manuscript attached to the Act of Uniformity of 1662 and now preserved in the House of Lords. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1892). 'By this it is to be understood that the text is here printed verbatim et litteratim, without any attempt to modernize the spelling . . . and that the punctuation has been most rigidly adhered to.' The preface, from which we are quoting, goes on to say, 'Whenever an erasure or correction occurs in the MS. the passage is printed as it was left after the making of such erasure or correction.' This, we venture to think, is a mistake. It has been shown, both in the pages of the Church Quarterly already referred to and in the columns of the Guardian for June and July 1891, that these erasures have a strong evidential value as showing, more especially as regards the construction of rubrics, that the compilers of our Prayer Book of set purpose rejected, after due consideration, certain constructions of those rubrics which have since found advocates. With this exception the book will be welcomed by all who are interested in the history of the Book of Common Prayer. During the discussions which have recently been going on in correspondence in the Times newspaper in connexion with the Grindelwald conference, some wiseacre asserted that the Preface to the English Ordinal had no legal force, as it formed no part of the real Book of Common Prayer. If he will turn to p. 510 of the volume before us he will find out his mistake. As an instance of the fidelity with which even the lapsus calami of the original manuscript are preserved we may notice Psalm lxviii. 3-'praise Him in his name, yea, and rejoice before Him.' For other peculiarities in the Annexed Book, here reproduced, we again refer our readers to the article in the Church Quarterly Review, July 1891. We trust this volume may find its way into every clergyman's library and not be allowed to remain on the shelves.

In connexion with the Prayer Book we may mention a useful little volume entitled Helps to the Study of the Book of Common Prayer; being a Companion to Church Worship (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press). It was issued, we believe, in the course of this year; but it bears no date and no author's name. The information it contains is full and accurate, and the tone of the book is excellent. There is no attempt to evade the loyal obedience to the plain meaning of the rubrics which eyery clergyman is bound to yield, no attempt to import practices and to observe festivals which the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer deliberately dropped. After some introductory pages 'on the structure of a Church and the meaning of its

<sup>1</sup> Church Quarterly Review, April 1891, p. 276, and July 1891, p. 465.

several parts,' and 'on the growth of the Book of Common Prayer,' the reader finds himself in the care of a trusty guide who takes him seriatim through the whole book and puts into his hand most useful explanatory and historical notes filled with a spirit of the utmost reverence and devotion.

The third edition of the well-known Variorum Reference Bible (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1892) has received a most welcome addition in the Apocrypha, edited and annotated by the Rev. C. J. Ball. One of the greatest difficulties in dealing with the Apocrypha consists in 'the endeavours to restore the lost original text of books which, for the most part, probably or certainly once existed in the Hebrew tongue.' In his preface Mr. Ball points out numerous instances where confusions of similar Hebrew letters have made sheer nonsense of the Greek text. In the present advanced state of knowledge in the departments of sacred history and criticism, an apology for the Apocrypha, as Mr. Ball justly observes, is 'superfluous or unmeaning.' He adds—

'Whether sheltered within the Canon, or suspiciously segregated without the Canon, or suspended between heaven and earth by controversial subtleties, a collection of books which has survived the changes and chances of two thousand years may safely claim to be valued on its merits, and received as its own sufficient apology.'

It is to be regretted that, as a rule, at S.P.C.K. and other Bible depôts imperfect copies are always offered for sale. A complete Bible, Apocrypha and all, is never laid before a purchaser unless specially demanded. Such at least is our experience.

The English Historical Review, edited by S. R. Gardiner, M.A., LL.D., No. 27, July 1892 (London: Longmans and Co., 1892), contains part i. of an article on 'The Church of the Resurrection, or of the Holy Sepulchre,' by the Rev. J. R. Macpherson, which just now comes very à propos in connexion with discussions still going on in the daily papers. The name of F. Seebohm will ensure attention to his review of the Russian Professor Vinogradoff's volume on 'Villainage in England' Professor Bryce's sympathetic memoir of the late Mr. Freeman was necessarily written in ignorance of the scathing article on the same great historian in the July number of the Quarterly Review.

We have before us three numbers of the *Dublin Review*, April, July, October 1892 (London: Burns and Oates, 1892), the first of which (April) escaped notice, *per incuriam*, in our last issue. We have always found the *Dublin Review* full of very interesting matter, and these three volumes form no exception. In the April number Canon Howlett discusses the 'The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch' from the conservative point of view, and the Rev. W. Lockhart and E. S. Purcell contribute the one some 'Personal Reminiscences of Cardinal Manning,' and the other 'Episodes in the Life of Cardinal Manning in his Anglican Days.' Both these articles are delightful reading. In the July number Canon Brownlow gives a popular account of De Rossi's 'Recent Discoveries in the Cemetery of St. Priscilla.' In the October number we have an article on 'The

Authorship and Composition of the Hexateuch,' by C. van den Biesen; another on 'The Great Religious Problem of the Nineteenth Century and Lux Mundi,' by Mr. Aubrey de Vere;' and a third on the late Bishop Goodwin's posthumous paper on 'Probability

and Faith,' 1 by John Morris, S.J.

Christ and Christendom; the Boyle Lectures for 1866, by E. H. Plumptre, D.D. (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh), is the latest issue which has reached us of the excellent Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature, which has placed so many standard theological works within the reach of the poorest curate, if he could only be induced to read them. Dean Plumptre's Boyle Lectures need no praise from us. We do not know whether the publishers do not mean to continue that series, but meanwhile they have started another called the Westminster Library, of which the only volumes that have reached us are The First Prayer Book of Edward VI., 1549, reprinted from a copy in the British Museum, followed by The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., 1552, reprinted from a copy in the British Museum. These editions are handy, well printed, and cheap.

Wise Words and Quaint Counsels of Thomas Fuller. Selected and arranged, with a short sketch of the author's life, by Augustus Jessop, D.D. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1892). These well-chosen specimens of Fuller's wit and wisdom are arranged under headings in alphabetical order. It is a delightful volume, as might be expected from the editor who planned it and the great University

press from which it issues.

The *Economic Review*, published quarterly for the Oxford University branch of the Christian Social Union (London: Percival and Co., 1892), has stolen a march upon us since we first called attention to its opening number. Those for April and July of the present year are now before us. All will turn—ay! and return with avidity—to Mr. Gore's paper on the 'Social Doctrine of the Sermon on the Mount,' which we venture to think will bear fruit. Its object seems to be—to put it briefly, which is all we can do—to devise some means of effecting an adequate organization of Christian moral opinion, and to make the Church the home and the centre of the best moral conscience of the community.

Note.—Canon Cheyne writes to us to deprecate the interpretation we placed on what he calls his 'descriptive reference' to Professor Klostermann as 'this Don Quixote of criticism,' in the *Church Quarterly Review* (January 1892, p. 367, and July 1892, p. 481). We characterized it as 'abuse instead of argument.' We must own that Canon Cheyne's words struck us as the reverse of complimentary to Klostermann, but we feel that the word 'abuse' was too strong. We regret that Canon Cheyne should have been pained by it, and we desire to withdraw it.

an

tru

te

H

ap

th

hc

We

SC

je

T

gr po m

st

Pear

su

W

di

<sup>1</sup> Contemporary Review, January 1892.